OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO. ED 056 253			
CH ACC. NO. AA 000 744	P.A.	PUBL. DATE 71	ISSUE RIEMAR72

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Friedman, Nathalie; Thompson, James

TITLE
The Federal Educational Opportunity Grant Program: A Status Report, Fiscal Year 1970. Final Report.

SOURCE CODE
QPX17250

INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
Columbia Univ., N. Y., N. Y. Bureau of Applied Social Research

SP. AG. CODE
BBB02244

SPONSORING AGENCY
Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D. C. Office of Program Planning and Evaluation

EDRS PRICE
0.65;13.16

CONTRACT NO.

GRANT NO.
OEG-0-9-099013-4643

REPORT NO.

BUREAU NO.
BR-9-9013

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
387p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Educational Opportunities; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Academic Education; Incentive Grants; *Federal Aid; Tables (Data); Bibliographies; Colleges; Young Adults; Questionnaires; Financial Support; Student Reaction; Research Methodology; *Higher Education; Administrative Problems; Economically Disadvantaged; Universities; Program Evaluation

IDENTIFIERS
*Educational Opportunity Grant; EOG

ABSTRACT

This report on the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) Program is based on data obtained from students receiving grants and from financial aid personnel administering the program at the institutional level. The data cover fiscal year 1970 (academic year 1969-70). An analysis of the data was performed to assess the extent to which the program goal of extending the opportunity for higher edcuation to high school graduates of exceptional financial need was being met. The major conclusion resulting from the analysis is that the EOG program is achieving its goal. Fourteen major recommendations stemming from the study are given. The seven chapters of the report are: Evaluation Research; Methodology; "The EOG Student"; The EOG Institution; Financial Aid: Policies, Practices, Packaging; The Site Visits; and Components of Program Success. The text proper contains 57 tables, and Appendix A is comprised of 26 supplementary tables. Appendix B contains the results obtained from analyzing institutional and student responses by institutional type and control. States in Federal DHEW Regions during FY 1970 and 1971 are listed in Appendix C, and Appendix D lists the 20 Site Visit Schools. A 65-citation bibliography is given, and copies of the questionnaire for institutions and the questionnaire for students are provided. (DB)

ED 056 253

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

THE FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM

A Status Report, Fiscal Year 1970

Nathalie Friedman

with the assistance of
James Thompson

1971

AA 000 744

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Columbia University
605 West 115th Street
New York, N. Y. 10025

The Bureau of Applied Social Research is an instrument of Columbia University's Graduate Faculties for training and research in the social sciences. The Bureau has for many years served as the research laboratory of the Department of Sociology, and it also facilitates social research by students and faculty of other departments and schools of the University. The Bureau's governing board includes representatives from all of the University's social science departments and several professional schools.

The Bureau carries on a program of basic and applied research under grants and commissions from foundations, government agencies, social welfare and other nonprofit organizations, and business firms. In so doing it provides experience on major empirical studies to graduate students and makes available data and facilities for student projects; it provides research facilities to faculty members; it offers training and consultation to visiting scholars, especially from social research institutes in other countries; and it makes the results of its investigations available through publications for lay and scientific audiences.

A bibliography of Bureau books, monographs, articles, unpublished research reports, dissertations, and masters' essays may be obtained from the Bureau's Librarian.

FINAL REPORT

Grant No. OEG-0-9-099013-4643

THE FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM:

A STATUS REPORT, FISCAL YEAR 1970

Nathalie Friedman
with the assistance of James Thompson

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
605 West 115th Street
New York, New York 10025

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Office of Program Planning and Evaluation

FINAL REPORT

Grant No. OEG-0-9-099013-4643

THE FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM:

A STATUS REPORT, FISCAL YEAR 1970

Nathalie Friedman
with the assistance of James Thompson

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
605 West 115th Street
New York, New York 10025

1971

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinion stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Office of Program Planning and Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 3

CHAPTER ONE. EVALUATION RESEARCH 15

CHAPTER TWO. METHODOLOGY 29

Section I. Kinds of Data Collected 29
Section II. Selecting the Student Sample 33
Section III. Response Rates 36
Section IV. Response Bias 43

CHAPTER THREE. "THE EOG STUDENT" 49

Section I. "The EOG Student" 51
Section II. The EOG Student and National Norms 77

CHAPTER FOUR. THE EOG INSTITUTION 84

Section I. A Description of Participating Institutions 87
Section II. Recruitment 98
Section III. Admissions 111
Section IV. Retention 131

CHAPTER FIVE. FINANCIAL AID: POLICIES, PRACTICES, PACKAGING 150

Section I. Financial Aid Policy and Practice 150
Section II. Student Attitudes toward Financial Aid . . 168

CHAPTER SIX. THE SITE VISITS 181

Section I. Program Contexts 181

Section II. Program Administration 185

Section III. Special Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged 191

Section IV. Recommendations 200

CHAPTER SEVEN. COMPONENTS OF PROGRAM SUCCESS 205

Section I. Administrative Problems 206

Section II. Perceived "Success" 219

Section III. Administrative Styles and Program Success 223

Section IV. Funding 233

APPENDICES. 237

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables 237

Appendix B. Institutional and Student Variables by Institutional Type and Control 274

Appendix C. States in Federal DHEW Regions (Fy 1970 and 1971) 333

Appendix D. Site Visit Schools 336

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 338

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

2.1 Selected Characteristics of Schools in EOG Universe and of Schools from Which Student Samples Were Drawn by Program Size 35

2.2 Distribution of EOG Recipients in the Universe and in the Sample by Size of Program 36

2.3 Institutional Questionnaire Response Rate by Selected Characteristics 38

2.4 Student Questionnaire Response Rate by Selected Characteristics 41

2.5 Response Rate for Students from "Packet" Schools by Program Size 42

2.6 Percentage Distribution of Selected Characteristics of Responding and Non-Responding Institutions 44

2.7 Percentage Distribution of Selected Characteristics Reported by FAO for Responding and Non-Responding Students 46

2.8 Race and Ethnic Background of Selected Groups of Respondents and of All 1968-69 Recipients 48

3.1 Family Income of EOG Students 51

3.2 Selected Characteristics of EOG Students by Annual Family Income 55

3.3 Selected Demographic, Academic, Financial and Attitudinal Characteristics of EOG Students by Annual Family Income 57

3.4 Racial and Ethnic Background of FAO Sample and EOG Universe 66

3.5 Selected Characteristics of EOG Students by Race and Ethnic Background 67

3.6 Percentage Distribution of Selected Background Characteristics for EOG Freshmen and ACE Sample 78

3.7 A Comparison of EOG Freshmen and the ACE Sample on Selected Academic Items 81

List of Tables

Table Page

4.1 Institutions Participating in EOG Compared with All Institutions of Higher Education by Control 88

4.2 Distribution of Schools Participating in the EOG Program and of All Institutions of Higher Education by Federal Region 89

4.3 Average Tuition and Fees and Average Room and Board Charges in EOG Institutions and in All Institutions of Higher Education 90

4.4 Selected Characteristics of Institutions Participating in the EOG Program by Type and Control 91

4.5 Selected Characteristics of Students by Type and Control of Institution 94

4.6 Recruitment Activities of EOG Institutions by Type and Control 100

4.7 Percentage of EOG Students from Minority Backgrounds by Factors Limiting Recruitment 104

4.8 Recruitment Index Score by Selected Characteristics . . . 106

4.9 Selected Characteristics of Program "Success" by Position on the Recruitment Index 109

4.10 Mean Percent of EOG Students and of All Undergraduates for Whom the Usual Admissions Criteria Are Waived or Modified by Selected Characteristics 113

4.11 Selected Characteristics of "High Risk" and Other Students 118

4.12 Selected Characteristics of "High Risk" and Non-"High Risk" Students by School Quality 119

4.13 Percentage of Black and White Students Classified as "High Risk" by Selected Characteristics 120

4.14 Selected Characteristics of "High Risk" and Non-"High Risk" Students by Race. 122

4.15 Mean Income, SAT-V, ACT Scores of Black and White "High Risk" and Non-"High Risk" Students by School Quality 123

List of Tables

Table | Page

4.16 Mean Percent of EOG Students and of All Undergraduates Ranked in Top Quartile of High School Class by Selected Characteristics 126

4.17 Mean Dollar Amount of EOG by High School Quartile Rank by Selected Characteristics 129

4.18 Mean Percent of EOG and of All Undergraduates Using Supportive Services by Selected Characteristics 133

4.19 Percent of Students Using Supportive Service by Selected Student and Institutional Characteristics . . . 135

4.20 Mean Percent of EOG Students and of All Undergraduates Living on Campus by Selected Institutional Characteristics 136

4.21 Cumulative GPA of Black and White EOG Students by Residence and by High School Quartile Placement 138

4.22 Mean Percent of 1968-69 Freshmen EOG Recipients and All 1968-69 Freshmen Who Reenrolled in 1969-70 by Selected Characteristics 140

4.23 Percentage of All 1968-69 EOG Students Who Terminated Their Studies for Financial or Academic Reasons by Selected Characteristics (Fiscal-Operations Data) . . . 146

5.1 Financial Aid Policies and Practices of Institutions Participating in the EOG Program by Type and Control, and by Racial Composition of Student Body 152

5.2 Sufficiency of EOG Allocation by Percentage of Panel Approved Amount State Actually Received 155

5.3 Selected Correlates of Institutional Practice of Limiting Size of EOG's to Cover More Students 163

5.4 The Packaging of Financial Aid for Students by Racial Composition of Student Body 165

5.5 The Packaging of Financial Aid by Institutional Type and Control 166

5.6 Student Attitudes Toward Kinds of Financial Aid by Selected Student Characteristics 169

List of Tables

Table Page

5.7 Percentage of Students Very Satisfied with College by Attitude Toward Work and Loans and by Whether Student Works or Has a Loan 174

5.8 Source of Federal Financial Aid by Characteristics of EOG Students 176

5.9 Packaging of Federal Financial Aid by Race (Fiscal-Operations Data 1969) 179

7.1 Administrative Problems Reported by Financial Aid Personnel by Institutional Type and Control 208

7.2 Number of Problems Reported by Selected Institutional Characteristics 212

7.3 Percent Reporting Three or More Problems by Position on Recruitment Index and by Selected Institutional Characteristics 215

7.4 Perceived Effects of the EOG Program by Number of Problems Reported 217

7.5 Selected Student and Institutional Characteristics by Perceived Success of EOG Program 220

7.6 Administrative Style for Recruitment Activities by Selected Institutional Characteristics 225

7.7 Selected Institutional Characteristics by Administrative Style 228

7.8 "Perceived Success" of EOG Program by Administrative Style and by Size of EOG Program 230

7.9 Selected Indicators of "Success" by Administrative Style and by Size of EOG Program 232

7.10 Percentage of Panel Approved Amount State Received by Selected Institutional Characteristics 235

A2.1 Percentage of Student Non-Respondents by Selected Characteristics 238

A3.1 Selected Characteristics of EOG Students by Family Income and by Race 239

List of Tables

Table Page

A3.2 Selected Characteristics of Independent and Parent-Supported Students 245

A3.3 Selected Characteristics of EOG Students by Age 246

A3.4 Selected Characteristics of EOG Students by Type of Community in Which Student Grew Up 247

A3.5 Selected Characteristics of EOG Students by Sex 249

A3.6 (a) Percentage of Financial Aid Officers Reporting Student Income Under $3000 by Student's Reported Family Income and by Student Status 251

(b) Percentage of Students Reporting Family Income Above $6000 by Financial Aid Officer Income Data and by Student Status 251

A3.7 Percentage Expecting to Earn $15,000 a Year or More by Occupational Choice and by Race 252

A3.8 Characteristics of Black and White EOG Students in Predominantly Black and White Institutions 253

A4.1 Mean Percentage of All Students and of EOG Students Who are Male by Selected Institutional Characteristics . 256

A4.2 Selected Characteristics of "High Risk" Students by School Quality 257

A4.3 Percentage of Students Reporting That Without Financial Aid They Would Have Been Unable to Go to College or Would Have Attended a Different College by Recruitment Activities of Institution 258

A4.4 Recruitment Activities and Limitations on Recruitment by School Quality 259

A4.5 Selected Financial Characteristics of EOG Institutions by Type, Control, and by Federal Region 260

A5.1 Mean Dollar Amount of EOG Award by Selected Characteristics 261

A5.2 Mean Percentage of All Students Receiving Financial Aid by Selected Characteristics 262

List of Tables

Table Page

A5.3 Mean Dollar Amount EOG by When Student Found Out He Was Eligible for Financial Aid and by Institutional Type-Control and Race 263

A5.4 Students' Financial Aid Packages by Selected Institutional Characteristics 264

A5.5 Percentage of Students Receiving State Scholarships or Other Scholarships by Federal Region 265

A5.6 Percentage of Students Receiving State or Other Scholarships (Non-Federally Funded) by Selected Student Characteristics 266

A5.7 Number of Students with National Defense Loans or Work-Study Jobs: Student Sample and Financial Aid Officer Sample 267

A5.8 Source of Federal Financial Aid by Selected Characteristics 268

A5.9 Packaging of Student Financial Aid by Selected Student and Institutional Characteristics 270

A7.1 Percentage of Institutions Reporting That EOG Program Has Had Little Impact by Selected Institutional Characteristics 271

A7.2 Extent to Which Gathering Race/Ethnic Data is a Problem by Number of Black and Spanish Students, and by Racial Composition of Institution 272

A7.3 "Perceived Success" of EOG Program by Selected Institutional Characteristics 273

PREFATORY NOTE

This report on the Educational Opportunity Grant Program is based on data obtained from students receiving grants and from financial aid personnel administering the program at the institutional level. The data cover fiscal year 1970 (academic year 1969-70) and the findings are applicable to conditions existing during this year.

Both student and administrator respondents contributed generously of their time by completing questionnaires, supplying statistical data, and--in some instances--spending long hours discussing their experiences in the program with the investigators. In addition, personnel at the Office of Education (Bureau of Higher Education) have been most helpful, as have been administrators at the regional level.

Intellectual guidance and stimulation were provided by many of my colleagues at the Bureau of Applied Social Research, in particular, Dr. Sam Sieber, the Principal Investigator for the study. Special thanks are due, however, to Lois Sanders who reviewed the manuscript with painstaking thoroughness and whose insights and suggestions have been incorporated in the final report. A final expression of gratitude is due to Carol Dulaney who organized, coordinated, and executed the complex tasks involved in conducting a study of this size.

The reader should bear in mind that there is a basic premise upon which the study rests. We have proceeded on the assumption that the program goal (of extending the opportunity for higher education to high school graduates of exceptional financial need) is a good one; the objective of the analysis was to assess the extent to which this goal is being achieved rather than to question the value of the goal itself.

SUMMARY

Background

The Educational Opportunity Grants (EOG) Program was established under the Higher Education Act of 1965. Administered through the U.S. Office of Education, its purpose is:

> to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means of their own or their families would be unable to obtain such benefits without such aid.

The program is implemented through allocations to participating institutions which distribute the monies to needy students. Grants may range from $200 to $1000 depending upon assessment of need, but may constitute no more than half of the student's total aid package. Guidelines for institutional administration of the program are set forth in the legislation (as passed in 1965 and amended in 1969), in the EOG Manual, and in periodic memoranda to participating schools.

Objectives of Study

In the summer of 1969, the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University was awarded a contract by the U.S. Office of Education to study the students and institutions participating in the EOG program. The objectives of the study were:

(1) To identify the demographic, academic, and attitudinal characteristics of students receiving EOG's;

(2) To describe the characteristics of institutions participating in the EOG program and to note the procedures and problems involved in the administration of the program.

(3) To examine the financial aid packages, policies, and practices of institutions as well as the financial aid packages awarded to students.

(4) To determine the extent and effectiveness of institutional efforts to recruit, admit, and retain students of exceptional financial need.

Procedures of Study

The following data have been collected:

(1) Questionnaires from 9789 students receiving EOG's during academic year 1969-70. (Response rate was 78.1 per cent).

(2) Student Data Forms from 580 aid administrators, containing information on 10,166 students. (This represents 81.6 per cent of the administrators responding for 81.3 per cent of the EOG recipients).

(3) Questionnaires from 1620 of the 1939[1] participating institutions. (Response rate was 84.3 per cent).

(4) Factual material from U.S. Census, National Center for Educational Statistics, EOG Reports.

(5) Qualitative data obtained through interviews with administrators and students at twenty institutions throughout the country.

---

[1] This was the number of participating schools on July 1, 1969; more have entered since that time.

The sample of students was chosen as follows:

(1) The 1939 institutions were divided into three groups, based on the estimated number of grants to be awarded during 1969-70.

(2) Every large program (300 grants or more), every other medium-sized program (100-299 grants), and every fifth small-program institution constituted the sample of 711 schools from which students were selected.

(3) Administrators from the sample schools supplied the names of the students awarded EOG's for the 1969-70 academic year.[2]

(4) Students were selected from these lists as follows:

  (a) every twentieth student from large-program schools;

  (b) every tenth student from medium-sized program schools;

  (c) every fourth student from small-program schools.

Findings[3]

A. Students (Chapter Three)

1. When viewed against the yardstick of national (ACE) norms for entering freshmen (1969), EOG freshmen constitute a group from a distinctly lower socio-economic background and have proportionally almost four times as many students from minority backgrounds.

2. Seventy per cent of the EOG recipients come from families with annual incomes of less than $6000. The student whose family

---

[2] All but 14 institutions complied with our requests for these lists.

[3] Findings are based on the respondents--institutional and student. A comparison of respondents and non-respondents is presented in Chapter Two.

income exceeds $6000 receives a lower EOG, has more dependents in his family, and holds a guaranteed loan or non-state scholarship.

3. More EOG students than other undergraduates live on campus.
4. EOG students are not a homogeneous group. Income and race dramatically differentiate the demographic, academic, and attitudinal characteristics of students. Exceptionally low-income/minority students are more likely than other EOG recipients to:
    (a) be the first in the family to attend college
    (b) have grown up on a farm or small town in southern and border states
    (c) have been enrolled in a non-college preparatory program in high school, have ranked in the lower half of their high school class, and to have scored below the national mean of SAT-Verbal or ACT'S
    (d) say they would not have been able to attend college without financial aid
    (e) have decided only after completing high school to go to college and to have found out only after high school that they were eligible for financial aid
    (f) be vocationally oriented
    (g) attend public institutions, especially the two-year community colleges.
5. Compared to other students, however, the lowest income level/

minority students have as high (or even higher) educational, occupational, and income expectations.

6. Differences among students from the various income levels, as well as between racial groups, are compounded when both factors are taken into account simultaneously. At every income level, the black EOG recipient[4] enters college with more severe academic handicaps than the white student.
7. Efforts to compensate for these handicaps are apparent at every income level. The black student receives a higher EOG, a larger total financial aid package, and is more likely to be taking remedial courses or receiving special tutoring or counseling.
8. Student attitudes toward grants, work, and loans are related both to the make-up of their financial aid package and to family income and ethnic background. Better than 80% of the black students have negative attitudes toward working to pay for college whether employed or not, and the higher the income, the more opposed the students are to loans.

B. Institutions (Chapters Four, Five, and Seven)

1. Eight out of ten public, but only seven out of ten private institutions of higher education participate in the EOG program.
2. The two-year institutions, both public and private, have the highest proportion of EOG students with financial and academic handicaps.

---

[4] Differences between whites and the other minority-groups are not as clear-cut or consistent as those between whites and blacks.

3. Although most institutions engage in efforts to recruit disadvantaged students, about half have established special programs for this purpose. The most active recruiters are the private universities; least active are two-year institutions. All institutions cite insufficient funds as a factor limiting or preventing recruitment efforts. Almost half report that one of the chief impediments to recruitment activity is lack of funds for supportive services.
4. Many schools state that they limit recruitment efforts because they already have sufficient disadvantaged applicants. This appears to be a legitimate claim. Administrators at some of the other schools, however, are reluctant to increase the proportion of minority students on their campuses as they are of the opinion that these students may create academic, religious, or social problems.
5. All institutional types, but the university in particular, tend to waive the normal admissions criteria more frequently for EOG students than for other students. While a higher proportion of EOG students have ranked in the top quartile of their high school class than college students in general, this relationship is reversed in the private university.
6. The data suggest that high school rank is less a function of the objective achievement of the student than of the quality of the secondary school from which he is graduated. Similarly, the definition of "high risk" student depends less upon the objective

characteristics of the student than on the academic quality of the institution of higher education he attends.

7. With few exceptions, EOG's are not awarded as scholarships. There is no relationship between high school quartile rank and the size of an EOG. Private universities are the least likely to award EOG's to students of higher academic caliber.

8. In every type of school, EOG students are more likely than other undergraduates to receive remedial help. The use of supportive services among EOG students is most pronounced at the university level.

9. While there is wide variation in retention rates of EOG students among different types of institutions, there is little difference in reenrollment rates of EOG freshmen and other freshmen. Although EOG students enter with academic handicaps, by the end of the first year they have made sufficient progress to enable them to remain in school. Retention rates of EOG students are highest in private universities, lowest in two-year institutions.

10. Of the 254,000 students who received EOG's in 1968-69, well under 1 per cent withdrew for financial reasons, and approximately 3 per cent failed to reenroll for academic reasons.

11. Almost three-fifths of the institutions report that their EOG allocation for FY 1970 was inadequate, but 72 per cent of the predominantly black schools, in which two-thirds of the students receive financial aid, report inadequate funds.

12. Related to reports of inadequate funding are practices such as:
    (a) giving smaller awards to more students
    (b) giving priority to students with higher academic performance or to students who apply early--both of which penalize the student who decides to go to college only after completing high school.
13. Packaging practices are related to the availability to an institution of alternative sources of financial aid (endowments, state support) to serve as matching funds for EOG's.
14. The percentage of the panel-approved amount allocated to institutions within each state accounts for differences in reports as to the adequacy of EOG funds. In states funded at 85 per cent or higher, 56 per cent of the institutions report sufficient funds; in states funded at less than 70 per cent only 22 per cent report that their allocations were sufficient.
15. Overrepresented in states which are funded at less than 70 per cent are predominantly black institutions, public two-year schools, schools in low-income counties: in other words, funding is least adequate where the need is the greatest.
16. Fiscal-operations data indicate that student financial aid personnel are targeting EOG's to students of minority background. In 1968-69:
    (a) a lower proportion of black students (49%) than white students (69%) were enrolled in CWS and/or NDSL, but did not receive an EOG;

(b) almost twice the proportion of black students as white ones (13.1% compared to 7.3%) received aid under all three federal programs.

17. Most financial aid officers feel that the EOG program has definitely been sucessful at their school (80%). On the other hand, almost one-third (32.8%) state that EOG has had little impact at their school other than serving as a source of additional funds. The perceived success of the program is related to:

    (a) such institutional variables as program-size, recruitment efforts, and the proportion of students receiving financial aid;

    (b) student variables, such as the proportion of students with family incomes under $3000, from minority backgrounds, and who would have been unable to attend college without financial aid.

18. On most small campuses, and many medium sized ones as well, the financial aid officer occupies one or more additional positions (teacher, dean, etc.). This multiple-role playing is directly related to the reporting of administrative problems. Administrative differentiation[5] increases with program (and school) size. In large institutions, such administrative differentiation appears to contribute to program success; in medium-sized schools joint administration of financial aid and special recruitment programs seems to be a feasible arrangement.

---

[5] Separate administration of financial aid and special recruitment programs.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The major conclusion of this study is that the EOG program is achieving its primary objective of enabling students of exceptional financial need to obtain an education beyond high school. EOG's are being targeted to the low-income/minority student. Institutions are engaged in efforts to recruit disadvantaged students, are waiving the usual admissions criteria, and providing supportive services to overcome the academic handicaps with which many such students enter.

Although institutions encounter problems in administering the program, they overwhelmingly attest to the program's success and hope to expand it within the next few years. Financial aid personnel are firmly committed to the goal of aiding the most needy students; they are studiously attempting to follow offical guidelines. The primary concern, however, is how to meet commitments to increasing numbers of students, in the face of costs which are rising disproportionately to appropriations.

The major recommendations stemming from this study are:

(1) Modification of the state allocation formula to ensure channeling of funds to states with the greatest need; allocations should reflect in-state and interstate variations in the cost of living.

(2) Immediate and substantial increase in the funding of the EOG program to meet the needs which have been generated by increasing numbers of schools in the program, reported increases in the number of low-income students entering college, and higher costs of attending college.

(3) Separate institutional grants to underwrite the costs of recruitment activities and the concomitant remedial programs.

(4) Intensification of federal government efforts to distribute information regarding the availability of financial aid for education beyond high school. At the secondary level, dissemination of this type of information should begin no later than the ninth grade.

(5) Three-year forward funding to facilitate long-range planning and to guarantee the commitment made to the student in the spring.

(6) Increased funding at the regional level to offer technical assistance to the large number of small-program schools who report problems in administering the program.

(7) The establishment and funding in each region of a Financial Aid Advisory Commission under the auspices of the National Association of Financial Aid Officers. Members of this commission would provide direction to institutions in establishing the program, in setting up uniform need analysis systems, and in data collection techniques for completing applications and fiscal-operations reports.

(8) Elimination of the present $1000 ceiling on EOG's. The amount of the grant should be determined solely on the basis of student need in light of institutional costs.

(9) Elimination of the four-year limit on the eligibility of students for EOG's to provide continuous coverage for those requiring more than four years to complete college.

(10) Elimination of distinction between initial and renewal year monies to permit flexibility and greater discretion in the distribution

of awards at the institutional level.

(11) Prior consent of the student and his parents authorizing the institution to release academic and financial data for evaluating the program.

(12) Supplemental grants for institutions with high retention rates.

(13) Modifications of Application and Fiscal-Operations forms:

  (a) Initiate uniform reporting of program activities. Both forms should include the number of students in each income bracket and the dollar amount expended in each of these categories.

  (b) Data on both family and parental income for independent students.

  (c) Use of DHEW regional classification of Fiscal-Operations Reports.

(14) Making provision for longitudinal panel studies of these EOG recipients in order to assess the long-range effects of the program.

The above recommendations have been previously proposed by financial aid personnel at the institutional, regional, and national levels, and have been under discussion in Congressional committee. Their significance lies not so much in their originality as in the fact that, for the first time, there is a body of student and institutional data to buttress them.

CHAPTER ONE

EVALUATION RESEARCH

"Ours is an age of action programs where large organizations and huge expenditures go into the attempted solution of every conceivable social problem."[1] This has been nowhere more apparent in recent years than at the federal level where there has been a considerable increase in the number of social action programs designed to improve, in some manner and to some degree, the condition of those who might be called "disadvantaged" or "culturally deprived." Congress has appropriated large sums of money; new organizational structures have been created to administer these varied programs; manuals and directives to those responsible for implementing these programs at the local level have been drafted and revised; huge amounts of data on those who are being served by these programs have been amassed.

Despite the fact that systematic evaluation is a necessary accompaniment to rational social action, many of these recently established programs have yet to be evaluated. Undoubtedly, those who administer a social action program at the top level receive at least a minimum of feedback, both from middle and lower level implementers of the program, as well as from the "clients" whom the program is designed to reach. They become aware of some of the problem spots and cognizant of some of the program's weaknesses and strengths. Furthermore, they usually possess statistical data in the form of regular reports required of those implementing the program at the local level. To a certain degree, therefore, a continual process of "in-house" evaluation occurs.

---

[1] Hyman, H. H., Wright, C. R., and Hopkins, T. K., Applications of Methods of Evaluation: Four Studies of the Encampment for Citizenship, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1962, p. 3.

A comprehensive evaluation, however, entails collecting objective, systematic information about the results of a social action program. "The technical features of such inquiries are exceedingly complex," says Hyman,[2] and require that a specialized research organization, objective, impartial and free from constraint, undertake such a task. It is at this point that the social scientist can make a major contribution for, as Moynihan has noted, "The role of social science lies not in the formulation of social policy, but in the measurement of its results."[3]

A major area in which federal monies have been increasingly expended, has been student financial aid, administered under the aegis of the U.S. Office of Education. One such program in this area is the Educational Opportunity Grant Program, authorized under Title IV of the Higher Education Act in 1965 (and amended in 1968). Its purpose, as stated in the 1965 legislation is

> to provide, through institutions of higher education, educational opportunity grants to assist in making available the benefits of

---

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

[3] Moynihan, Daniel P., Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding: Community Action in the War on Poverty, The Free Press, New York, 1969, p. 193.

> higher education to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means of their own or their families would be unable to obtain such benefits without such aid.

After almost five years of operation, little was actually known about the extent to which the above goal was being achieved. Through Office of Education's annual Fiscal-Operations Reports, tremendous amounts of data were being collected from each institution. These data, however, were sufficient merely to provide a skeletal view of the racial and ethnic background, family income, and class level of the students receiving EOG's. Moreover, time, budget, and personnel limitations within the Office of Education enabled only superficial collation and analysis of the data being collected from participating institutions. Accordingly the U.S. Office of Education contracted with Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research to conduct a detailed study of the students and schools participating in the EOG Program. The report which follows presents the results of this study.

Before proceeding to present these results, however, it might be helpful to discuss briefly some of the general problems and procedures involved in "evaluation research," and then to relate these to the specific problems of evaluating the EOG Program.

Any action program is designed to achieve certain goals, and any evaluation of an action program must therefore attempt to assess the degree to which program goals have actually been achieved. Program goals, however, are not always explicitly stated, not always shared by those responsible for administering or implementing the program, and not always stable over an extended period of time. The lack of explicitness, consensus, and stability of program goals raises difficulties for the evaluator of a social action program.[4]

Explicitness

Although the goals of government action programs are usually explicitly stated in the legislation authorizing the program,[5] the general statement in the legislation may not exhaust the goals for the program as intended by Congress or by program officials. Therefore it becomes necessary for the evaluator to sift through the directives, memoranda, reporting and application forms, and other such materials which may provide further explicit statements or clues as to program goals. Similarly, interviews with those responsible for authorizing, administering, or implementing the program are necessary to reveal more fully the anticipated goals for the program.

Consensus

The problem of determining what are the goals of a program is compounded by the fact that there may be a lack of consensus among program officials, as well as between the latter and those responsible for implementing the program at the regional and local levels. While the effects of a social action program, therefore, may be positive from one point of view, they may be neutral or negative from another. A lack of consensus, regarding program objectives for example, was implicit in the language of the House of Representative's as compared to the Senate's bill amending the 1965 Higher Education Act (in 1968). Under the Senate bill, grants or contracts were to be authorized for (recruitment) programs to identify qualified high school youths "of financial or cultural need" with "an exceptional potential for post-secondary educational training." The House bill authorized such funds to identify youths of "exceptional financial need"; it eliminated the notion of "exceptional potential." The conference to resolve the differences between the two Houses adopted the Senate's language.[6] It is evident from the above that the House was placing even greater emphasis than the Senate on the goal of serving the student of exceptional financial need (as stated in the 1965 legislation.)[7]

---

[4] For a penetrating and extensive discussion of this subject see Louis, K. S. and Metzger, L., Measuring the Goals of Action Programs: A Case Study of a New Technique, Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York, 1971.

[5] See pages 2-3 for the general statement of the objectives of the EOG program as set forth in the Higher Education Act of 1965.

In addition to lack of consensus regarding program emphases among the congressmen who designed or voted for the legislation, intensive case studies of the financial aid operation at more than twenty institutions revealed that while there may be general consensus regarding over-all program goals, emphases of students, financial aid officers, other administrative officers, and regional/national officials are not always congruent. Students with whom we spoke were primarily concerned with the adequacy or inadequacy of their aid; financial aid officers emphasized the administrative problems; regional and national officials tended to define "success" in terms of the extent to which program directives were being adhered to. Admissions officers stressed recruitment and academic deans emphasized problems of retention of disadvantaged students. Thus students, institutional personnel, and program officials at the national or regional levels may all differ as to the area in which program effects are most desired.

---

[6] 90th Congress, 2nd Session, House of Representatives, Report No. 1919, p. 61.

[7] At the same time the House was rejecting the notion that true equalitarianism is compatible with an aristocracy of talent.

Stability

The modification or change of emphasis over time can further complicate the problem of evaluating a social action program. Particularly in the case of government programs may goals and emphasis shift with changes of Administration or with the resignation or replacement of program personnel. Such a change of emphasis has been evident in the case of the EOG Program--even during the past eighteen months. Implicit, for example, in the Amendments to the Higher Education Act (in 1968), in the memoranda to financial aid officers during 1968, 1969, and 1970, and in changes in the application form for funds (in October 1970) has been the increasing emphasis on the goal of concentrating efforts and resources upon the most disadvantaged students. The 1968 Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965, for example, raised the maximum grant from $800 to $1000 and eliminated the $200 academic incentive award to students placing in the top half of their college class. It also enabled institutions to increase the size of their awards by permitting a student's College Work-Study earnings to be used as matching funds. Page 1-1 of the 1970 Application Form further indicated the Administration's increased emphasis on targeting available funds to the exceptionally needy student. The program evaluator, therefore, must be alert to possible changes of program goals or emphases over time.

Once the evaluator has determined what are the goals of the program and has taken into account the possibility of lack of consensus and stability of program goals, then he may proceed to conceptualize program effects and to develop adequate indicators to enable the assessment of program success. This too raises problems, for the evaluator must determine the locus of program effects: that is, has the program affected individuals, organizations, communities, society? For example, has EOG enabled individuals to attend college? Has it altered the organizational structure, goals and policies of institution of higher education? Has it reduced community unrest or militancy? Has it raised the general education level of society?

The locus of effects of a program which an evaluator must conceptualize may be further specified, says Hyman, into "sub-regions." Let us assume that the major objectives of the EOG Program are aimed at individuals--students. Does this mean that the program has had positive effects if:

(1) it has brought a disadvantaged student into college?

(2) the student has adjusted academically?

(3) the student's educational and occupational aspirations are high?

(4) the student completes his education and enters an occupation higher than that of his father?

In other words, the "effect" of the program on the student may be behavioral, attitudinal, motivational--these would all constitute areas to be investigated in any evaluation of a program.

Similarly, if the locus or "region" under analysis is a collectivity, such as the college, there are also sub-regions for which the program may have had impact. Has the introduction of EOG

(1) changed the composition of the student body?
(2) modified attitudes of faculty, alumni, trustees?
(3) increased the relative power or authority of financial aid officers?
(4) altered organizational goals or structure?
(5) affected college-community relations?

This evaluation, as is true of most evaluations of social action programs, will focus on the program effects upon individuals (students) and upon aggregates (institutions), will specify the various sub-regions, such as attitudes, achievement, behavior, organizational structure, and then will operationalize these sub-regions in terms of specific variables to be measured.

"Further complicating the problem of conceptualization for the evaluator, is the dimension of time."[8] Most social action programs attempt to effect change in attitudes or behavior of individuals, or in goals or structure of organizations. The problem of the evaluator is then to assess the extent of change in the specified locus. This is normally done by using "before and after" measures. The problem may arise, however, as to how soon "before" and how long "after." Many programs may have "sleeper effects," that is, their impact on individuals or collectivities may not become apparent until months or even years later. Similarly, an evaluator might be interested in the extent of "persistence of effects." This would necessitate measuring the "after" at specified intervals over a period of months or years.

---

[8] Hyman, H. H. and Wright, C. R., "Evaluating Social Action Programs," in Lazarsfeld, P. F. et al., The Uses of Sociology, Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1967, p. 759.

In the case of the EOG program, the temporal problem is most complex. The study has taken place at one point in time, after institutions as well as students have been participating in the program for anywhere from several months to four years. The students represent only the first cohort receiving EOG's. Several questions, therefore, must be asked. After the first spirited efforts to recruit needy students, what next? Will staff become stale and tired? Will enthusiasm wane? Has the influx of this first cohort changed the complex of student body, the attitudes of administrators, the climate of the campus so that the next cohort is likely to possess different characteristics? A replication of the study perhaps three to four years later might help provide answers to these kinds of questions.

A second question one might ask concerns the more long-range "effects" of the program on the cohort studied. To what extent has there been a persistence of effects? Have recipients of EOG's completed the colleges they attended? Have they entered the occupations they had anticipated entering while in college? Have they pursued graduate study as they may have planned? A follow-up study would obviously be called for if one were to evaluate the long-range effects of an EOG Program on students.

In evaluating the EOG program, the temporal problem is compounded by the fact that the research design did not provide for a control group of students or institutions not participating in the EOG program. The temporal effects of the program, therefore, can only be inferred by controlling for the length of time an institution or student has participated in it. A more valid evaluation of the program calls for a follow-up of students (and institutions) several years from the time of their completion of the questionnaire in order to assess the long-range effects of EOG.

Another difficulty inherent in an evaluation of a program such as EOG is that today there are many programs designed to effect similar outcomes--namely to help provide the benefits of higher education to financially needy high school graduates. How does the evaluator determine the extent to which EOG, rather than CWS, NDSL, a state loan or scholarship, or a local PTA grant has enabled an institution to increase its enrollment of especially disadvantaged students? Similarly, community pressures, as well as increased militancy of student demands, have led many schools to expand their efforts to recruit the "culturally deprived" high school graduate. The problem, therefore, of separating the effect of EOG from the effects of other similar programs or of other organizational or environmental factors faces the evaluator.

Perhaps the major difficulty inherent in evaluating a program such as EOG, however, stems from the fact that the program is administered at the grass roots level by 1900 administrators, in 1900 discrete institutions, each with its own distinctive student body, geographical locale, institutional goals, philosophical or religious outlooks, faculty interests, community relations problems, and so on. Therefore, the central directives, or uniform application and reporting forms which might give unity to the program, are translated into action, interpreted, or implemented by administrators of the program according to their own unique situations.

Furthermore, as Hyman notes, programs are administered by people, by a staff,[9] and "with one turnover of personnel, the findings of an evaluation may no longer apply." Accordingly, similar financial input of federal funds to two institutions will be handled with differing degrees of effectiveness.

Finally, it should be noted that evaluation seeks to do more than to provide objective evidence of the extent to which a program has achieved its explicitly stated, intended goals. The evaluator must always be alert to "the degree to which [the program] produces unanticipated consequences which when recognized would also be regarded as relevant to the social-action agency."[10] Such unintended consequences may be congruent with or contrary to the explicit objectives of the program.[11]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 754.

[10] Ibid., p. 762.

[11] Merton, R. K., "The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action," American Journal of Sociology, 1938.

One such unintended consequence of the federal student financial aid programs comes to mind. Several financial aid officers, in conversations with us during the site visits, mentioned that they devoted some time to "consulting" on an informal basis with other financial aid officers who were having difficulty administering the program at their schools, completing reports, requesting funds. The rewards of this activity accrued to the consultant personally either in the form of fees, or of peer recognition of expertise. Moreover, this recognition of expertise was beneficial to the financial aid officer's own institution since an important component of the regional panels' decisions on institutional funding is the extent to which the financial aid officer is regarded as competent and knowledgeable. It is interesting that this consultant role, as yet not institutionalized, has arisen as an unanticipated consequence of the sudden introduction of large sums of federal money into colleges.[12] This is just one example of the kinds of unintended results of social action programs for which an evaluator must be alert.

Problems of ascertaining goals, of conceptualizing, operationalizing, and isolating "effects," of accounting for the temporal dimension, of searching for unanticipated consequences--these are but a few of the problems confronting the evaluator of a social action program such as EOG.

---

[12] Only recently it appears that financial aid officers, in recognition of their lack of preparation for the demands imposed by these new programs are creating associations for the instruction of financial aid officers in the complexities of program administration.

Rather than abdicate, the answer lies in the two-step process which will be followed in presenting the EOG data. The first stage will be descriptive, the second analytical. The report will be divided as follows:

(1) Chapter Two describes the kinds of data collected, the sources of data, the method of selecting respondents, and concludes with a discussion of response rates (of institutions and students).

(2) If the EOG Program is targeted to reach the student of exceptional financial need, especially minority students, then a description of the socio-economic characteristics, academic backgrounds, and college decision-making processes of our EOG sample should enable us to assess the extent to which students receiving EOG's are those of exceptional financial need who, without the benefit of such aid would have been unable to attend college. In Chapter Three, therefore, we will describe the "EOG Student," that is, his racial, ethnic, socio-economic background; his "route to college"; his educational and occupational plans; his attitude toward college in general and toward financial aid in particular.

(3) In Chapter Four we identify the characteristics of institutions participating in EOG, that is, their type, control, size, racial composition, and geographic location. We present data to show the extent to which institutions participating in the EOG program have established special programs or are utilizing

various channels to recruit disadvantaged students, as well as the extent to which these institutions are using non-traditional yardsticks for admitting these students and special means for retaining them after admission.

(4) Chapter Five is devoted to a description and analysis of the financial aid policies and practices of institutions. It also presents data on student attitudes toward various forms of financial aid as well as a description of their financial aid packages.

(5) In Chapter Six we describe in depth the experiences, problems, procedures, and policies of twenty institutions in order to present more detailed information about the EOG Program and to explain relationships discovered through questionnaire analysis.

(6) Finally, in Chapter Seven we attempt to pinpoint those institutional characteristics and procedures that are correlated with perceived and actual "success" in administering the EOG program.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Section I. Kinds of Data Collected

Data on Institutions

As of July 1, 1969 (when the study began) there were 1,939 institutions of higher education and an estimated 260,000 students participating in the EOG program.[1] Every participating institution received a mailed questionnaire to be completed by the financial aid officer and designed to obtain information in the following areas:[2]

(a) General institutional data (minority enrollment, admissions, academic level of the student body, tuition, fees, percentage living on campus, etc.);

(b) Statistics on EOG recipients and program (number of minority recipients, academic level, attrition rates, proportion living on campus, etc.);

(c) Procedures, policies, and problems involved in administering the EOG program at each school;

(d) Information on recruitment and supportive programs;

---

[1] These figures are based on the Notification to Members of Congress, EOG Report No. 1-69 and the supplementary notifications prior to July 1, 1969.

[2] Copies of all instruments used in the EOG study are appended to this report.

(e) The institution's own assessment of the impact of the EOG program.

Although the major source of institutional data has been the questionnaire, additional institutional data have been obtained from several other sources:

1. Fiscal Operations Reports

Fiscal Operations Reports for the year 1968-69 were submitted by all participating institutions to the U.S. Office of Education in August 1969. These reports contained the following information for each school:

(a) Number of students enrolled in the EOG program
(b) Breakdown of EOG recipients by:
    (1) Initial vs. renewal grants
    (2) Race
    (3) Enrollment in NDSL and CWS programs
    (4) Academic level
    (5) Family income
    (6) Academic rank in high school
(c) Recruitment source
(d) Enrollment in supportive programs
(e) Attrition rates

The data from these fiscal operations reports have been summarized and will be presented in subsequent chapters.

2. Master Data Deck

A master data deck was constructed by compiling published data on each institution. These data were obtained from the following sources:

Type of Information	Source
(a) Estimated number of EOG's, 1969-70	Notification to Members of Congress, EOG Report No. 1-69
(b) Federal region, type, control, race, opening fall enrollment	Opening Fall Enrollment, 1966, 1968 National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education
(c) Estimated number of EOG's, 1970-71	Notification to Members of Congress, EOG Report No. 1-70
(d) Demographic characteristics of county in which institution is located	U.S. Census, County and City Data Book, 1962

Utilization of these data considerably reduced the length of the institutional questionnaire and the burden on the financial aid officer.

3. Site Visits

Site visits have been made to twenty schools, including at least one in each of the ten DHEW regions. An entire day has been spent at each school in conversation with financial aid personnel, individuals responsible for recruitment or supportive programs, Deans of Students, academic deans, faculty, and students. The purpose of these visits has been to obtain the kind of qualitative information about an institution and its EOG Program which is unobtainable through survey analysis alone. The information obtained through these sight visits is presented in Chapter Six.

Data on Students

Information about students participating in the EOG program during 1969-70 has come from two sources--students themselves and financial aid officers. A sample of almost 10,000 students from 711 schools responded to a Student Questionnaire yielding the following kinds of information:

(a) Demographic background

(b) Educational background

(c) Current educational and financial status

(d) Attitudes toward college and financial aid

(e) Career and educational plans

Data on students in the sample were also collected from financial aid officers at the sample schools. A short data form yielded information about the student's class level, residence, grade point average (GPA) and quartile placement, financial aid, family income, high school rank, test scores, race, and sex. Altogether, data forms were returned by 580 administrators providing information on 10,166 students. This represents 81.6 per cent of the schools responding for 81.3 per cent of the students.[3]

---

[3] In light of the extensive paperwork required in completing these data forms, the response rate of 81.6 per cent is extremely surprising. It should be noted, however, that despite this high response rate, there are several serious problems attendant upon the use of these data forms.

Much of the information supplied is impossible to standardize for purposes of analysis. Some institutions base their G.P.A.'s on a 3-point scale, others on a 4-point one, etc. Some report test scores in raw figures; others use percentiles, etc.;

Some of the information requested was omitted in a large percentage of cases because it was unavailable (high school rank,

Section II. Selecting the Student Sample

Since for statistical purposes it is not necessary to obtain responses from every individual in a large universe, it was decided to select a sample of students from the approximately 260,000 receiving EOG's. A frequency distribution of participating institutions by the number of awards granted for 1969-70 indicated that over half (52 per cent) of the awards were granted by only 12 per cent of the schools, while 20 per cent of all awards were granted by over 1,200, or 66 per cent of the institutions participating in the EOG program.

Interest is obviously focused on those schools which are receiving large EOG allocations. It was decided therefore to select a sample of students from every school with a large (300 or more awards) EOG program, from every other school with a medium-sized (100-299 awards) EOG program, and from every fifth school with a small (under 100 awards) EOG program. This procedure yielded 711 schools:

Small-program:	239 schools
Medium-program:	243 schools
Large program:	229 schools

---

percentile standing in high school or college);

Some information requested was omitted because of reluctance on the part of the financial aid office to supply it (e.g., race, name and address). Omission of the latter item makes it impossible to match the data form with the student questionnaire;

Although institutions were extremely cooperative about completing the Institutional Questionnaire and supplying lists of students to whom we sent questionnaires, a substantial number have either refused or expressed deep reluctance to complete the data forms for several reasons:

a. Their concern about preserving the anonymity of the students and about releasing any information without the student's consent;
b. The lack of time and personnel to obtain and transcribe the information requested.

Table 2.1 compares small- and medium-sized sample schools with all small- and medium-sized EOG schools on selected characteristics. It can be seen that when EOG program size is held constant, there are no significant differences between sample schools and schools in the EOG universe. Four-year and public institutions are perhaps slightly overrepresented in the sample of small-program schools but among medium-program schools the close resemblance between sample schools and all schools is apparent.

The financial aid officer in each sample school was asked to provide a listing of all students receiving EOG's during 1969-70. All but fourteen financial aid officers complied with this request. The student sample was then drawn from these lists as follows:

> 25 per cent of the recipients from small-program schools, or 2,271 students;
>
> 10 per cent of the recipients from medium-program schools, or 4,150 students;
>
> 5 per cent of the recipients from large-program schools, or 6,074 students.

This sampling procedure resulted in a total of 12,405 students to whom questionnaires were mailed directly.[4]

---

[4] Approximately 275 students were not sent Student Questionnaires directly since the fourteen schools in which they were enrolled had not returned their listings of EOG recipients. Instead, a packet of student questionnaires was sent to each of the fourteen schools and the financial aid officer was provided with instructions for distributing them to a sample of recipients.

TABLE 2.1

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS IN EOG UNIVERSE AND OF SCHOOLS FROM WHICH STUDENT SAMPLES WERE DRAWN BY PROGRAM SIZE

Selected Characteristics	Small-Program Schools		Medium-Program Schools	
	In EOG Universe (Per cent)	In Sample (Per cent)	In EOG Universe (Per cent)	In Sample (Per cent)
Type				
University	2.6%	3.3%	13.0%	14.4%
Four-year	51.6	44.8	75.2	75.7
Two-year	45.7	51.9	11.8	9.9
Control				
Public	42.8%	47.7%	41.5%	43.6%
Private	57.2	52.3	58.5	56.4
Race				
Predominantly white	98.4%	99.2%	91.7%	93.4%
Predominantly black	1.6	.8	8.3	6.6
Federal Region*				
1	10.8%	10.9%	7.7%	7.8%
2	15.8	15.0	17.9	18.1
3	10.8	11.3	9.6	9.5
4	12.2	11.3	12.4	12.3
5	13.7	13.0	17.5	17.3
6	11.9	13.0	13.4	13.6
7	6.4	7.0	11.6	11.5
8	2.8	2.9	3.7	3.7
9	15.5	15.9	6.3	6.2
TOTAL	(1,202)	(239)	(492)	(243)

---

*See Appendix C for states in each region (as of July 1969 when sampling was done). See also new regional breakdown for which data in Chapters Three through Seven are presented.

TABLE 2.2

DISTRIBUTION OF EOG RECIPIENTS IN THE UNIVERSE
AND IN THE SAMPLE BY SIZE OF PROGRAM

Recipients in	In EOG Universe		In Sample	
	Estimated Number*	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Small Programs	53,000	20.2%	2,271	18.2%
Medium Programs	73,000	27.9%	4,150	33.2%
Large Programs	136,000	51.9%	6,074	48.6%
Total	262,000	100.0%	12,495	100.0%

*Estimate is based on estimated number of awards as listed in Notification to Members of Congress, EOG report No. 1-69.

Section III. Response Rates

In February 1970, questionnaires were mailed to approximately 12,500 students and the same number of student data forms was sent in packets to 711 institutions in which these students were enrolled; an institutional questionnaire was mailed to each of the 1,939 participating schools. A month later, a second questionnaire was sent to about 5,000 students who had not yet returned their forms, and follow-up letters and questionnaires were mailed to approximately 750 non-responding institutions. In June and July further follow-up letters were sent to about 450 institutions who had not yet responded, and Senior Program Officers in each of the Federal (DHEW) Regions were asked to follow-up schools in their respective regions. In addition, telephone calls were made to most schools which had not returned questionnaires by July 1, 1970.

Tables 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 present the response rates respectively for institutions, for students, and for "packet" schools. The overall institutional and student response rates of 84.3 per cent and 78.1 per cent are high when compared with institutional or student response rates in other studies.[5]

The high institutional response rate was the result of a combination of factors. First, perhaps, was the fact that the follow-up was quite comprehensive; each of the non-responding schools was approached by mail and if necessary by telephone; questions or hesitations on the part of financial aid officers were handled by project staff with alacrity; U.S. Office of Education regional personnel cooperated by telephoning non-responding institutions in their respective areas. A second factor contributing to the high institutional response rate may have been the letter to each school from Preston Valien, Acting Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, explaining the purpose of the study and asking for cooperation. Most important,

---

[5] For example, Bowers' study (Bowers, W. J., Student Dishonesty and its Control in College, Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York, 1964) elicited a 60 per cent response rate from students at 100 selected colleges. Nash's study of Urban Corps summer interns (Nash, G. and Nixon, J., Response to Challenge: The New York City Urban Corps, Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York, 1967) drew a 53 per cent response rate. Similarly, a study of California's Educational Opportunity Programs (Kitano, H. and Miller, D., An Assessment of Educational Opportunity Programs in California Higher Education, Scientific Analysis Corporation, California, 1970) elicited only a 60 per cent institutional response.

TABLE 2.3

INSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics	Sample Schools		Non-Sample Schools		Total	
	Number of Schools	Response Rate	Number of Schools	Response Rate	Number of Schools	Response Rate
Program size (n)		(239)		(963)		
Small	239	87.4%	963	83.7%	1,202	84.4%
Medium	243	82.3%	249	83.5%	492	82.9%
Large	229	86.0%	-	-	229	86.0%
Type						
University	145	86.2%	53	84.9%	198	85.8%
Four-year	411	86.6%	701	81.8%	1,112	83.5%
Two-year	155	80.6%	458	86.5%	613	85.0%
Control						
Public	398	85.7%	496	87.9%	894	86.9%
Private	313	84.7%	716	80.7%	1,029	81.9%
Race						
Predominantly white	658	85.7%	1,169	84.2%	1,827	84.8%
Predominantly black	53	79.2%	43	67.4%	96	74.0%
Federal Region						
1	56	83.9%	122	78.7%	178	80.3%
2	110	74.5%	201	76.1%	311	75.6%
3	78	88.5%	126	79.4%	204	82.8%
4	82	80.5%	149	87.2%	231	84.8%
5	115	89.6%	176	85.2%	291	86.9%
6	90	91.1%	147	87.8%	237	89.0%
7	77	87.0%	90	84.4%	167	85.6%
8	23	82.6%	36	97.2%	59	91.5%
9	80	88.8%	165	87.9%	245	88.2%
TOTAL	711	85.2%	1,212	83.7%	1,923	84.3%

however, was the apparent belief of many financial aid officers (as expressed in their correspondence with us) that the data resulting from the study would be utilized to strengthen the program and would serve as an impetus to increase federal funding for student financial aid.

Similar hopes or expectations probably contributed to the high student response rate. Many students (not recognizing that the Bureau of Applied Social Research was unconnected with the source of the funds they were receiving) thanked us profusely for their grants or pleaded for additional money. This led us to suspect that the exceptionally high student response rate was partially the result of students' fears that non-response might lead to a cutting-off of their EOG's.[6]

The high overall response rate, however, may mask a differential response rate by selected student or institutional characteristics. Further examination of Table 2.3 indicates that there is almost no difference in the response rate by institutional type or by size of EOG program, but that the administrators in public colleges were slightly more likely than those in private ones to return questionnaires.[7] Predominantly Negro schools had the lowest institutional response rate.

---

[6] That some students may have been cowed into participation because of fear of losing their grants, raises the ethical question of invasion of privacy. For a discussion of this issue, see Weiss, C. H., "Ethical and Political Issues in Social Research," The Social Welfare Forum, National Conference of Social Welfare, 1970.

[7] Perhaps these administrators, in state or locally controlled schools, are generally more accustomed to demands for regular reporting and therefore have established machinery and personnel for such purposes.

The lower response rate from administrators in predominantly Negro colleges is not surprising. In their recent study of black higher education, Jaffe _et al_. note that these schools are expanding rapidly and that current concern about higher education for blacks has led to repeated requests for data from these schools. These factors have placed increasing burdens on administrative and clerical personnel, making it difficult for them to comply with requests from researchers.[8]

Finally, an examination of institutional response rates by Federal Region (Table 2.3) reveals a variation from a "low" of 76 per cent to a high of 92 per cent (in Region VIII). The variation by region is possibly a function of the communication (regarding the study) between the U.S. Office of Education in Washington and their respective regions as well as between the Bureau of Applied Social Research and each region. In fact, our experience in this study accentuates the extreme importance of regular communication with administrators at _all_ levels of the program which is being evaluated.[9]

Students in public institutions responded at about the same rate as those in the private sector (Table 2.4). Similarly, response rates of students in small-, medium-, or large-program schools were

---

[8] Jaffe, A., Adams, W., and Meyers, S. G., _Negro Higher Education in the 1960's_, Praeger, New York, 1968, pp. 223-25.

[9] It is interesting to note that the response rate for sample schools is slightly higher than for non-sample ones (85.2 per cent and 83.7 per cent, respectively) despite the burden on the former to complete Student Data Forms as well as Institutional Questionnaires. This too may underline the efficacy of communication with program administrators. We were in substantially more communication with the sample institutions in order to expedite completion and return of the data forms.

TABLE 2.4

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics	Number of Sample Students	Response Rate
Program Size		
Small	2,271	80.1%
Medium	4,150	78.6%
Large	6,074	77.1%
Type		
University	3,702	78.8%
Four-year	7,251	79.0%
Two-year	1,542	72.9%
Control		
Public	7,666	77.5%
Private	4,829	79.1%
Race		
Predominantly white	11,228	78.8%
Predominantly black	1,267	72.7%
Federal Region		
1	824	77.9%
2	1,892	71.4%
3	1,415	81.0%
4	1,377	80.7%
5	2,206	81.7%
6	1,626	84.4%
7	1,422	77.9%
8	420	81.4%
9	1,313	67.9%
TOTAL	12,495	78.1%

about the same. Students in two-year colleges, however, as well as those in predominantly black schools were somewhat less likely to complete questionnaires than were those in four-year or predominantly white institutions. The response rates reflect variations in the characteristics of students (racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds) at different types of institutions.[10]

In contrast to the very high overall response rates, the low response rate from "packet schools" (Table 2.5) is accounted for by the probable failure of seven of these fourteen institutions to distribute questionnaires to a sample of EOG recipients as requested. Fewer than 200 students (1 per cent of the entire sample) never received questionnaires for this reason.

TABLE 2.5

RESPONSE RATE FOR STUDENTS FROM "PACKET" SCHOOLS BY PROGRAM SIZE

Program Size	Estimated Number in Sample*	Number of Respondents	Response Rate
Small	52	34	65%
Medium	106	24	23%
Large	131	74	65%
All "Packet" Schools	289	132	46%

*Estimate was based an estimated number of awards as listed in Notification to Members of Congress, EOG Report No. 1-69.

---

[10] A comparison of characteristics of responding and non-responding EOG recipients is presented at the end of this chapter.

Section IV. Response Bias

The preceding section has documented and partially explained the differential response rates by school type, control, region, racial composition, and size of EOG program. In this section we compare the characteristics of responding and non-responding institutions and students in order to assess the extent to which non-response reduces our ability to generalize our findings.

Institutions

Table 2.6 permits a comparison of the universe and of non-responding institutions on selected characteristics. It is clear that these two groups do not differ substantially in respect to EOG program size, control, type, racial composition or Federal Region. Four-year schools are slightly over-represented among our non-respondents as are private and predominantly Negro institutions. Similarly, as was noted in Table 2.3, Region II is over-represented. Since much of the data in later chapters will be presented separately for schools of different control, type and racial composition, we do not expect that this slight over- or under-representation will bias our results.

Students

For 2,000 students who failed to return their questionnaires we have information provided by their schools which enables us to compare all students with non-responding students on selected characteristics. In Table 2.7 it can be seen that there are several characteristics which differentiate non-respondents from all EOG students in the sample.

TABLE 2.6

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDING AND NON-RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Selected Characteristics	All EOG Schools (1,923)	Responding Schools (1,620)	Non-Responding Schools (303)
Program Size			
Small	62.5%	62.7%	61.8%
Medium	25.6	25.2	27.7
Large	11.9	12.2	10.6
Type			
University	10.3%	10.5%	9.2%
Four-year	57.8	57.3	60.4
Two-year	31.9	32.2	30.4
Control			
Public	46.5%	48.0%	38.6%
Private	53.5	52.0	61.4
Race			
Predominantly white	95.0%	95.6%	91.8%
Predominantly black	5.0	4.4	8.2
Federal Region			
1	9.3%	8.8%	11.6%
2	16.2	14.5	25.1
3	10.6	10.4	11.6
4	12.0	12.1	11.6
5	15.1	15.6	12.5
6	12.3	13.0	8.6
7	8.7	8.8	7.9
8	3.1	3.3	1.6
9	12.7	13.3	9.6

Blacks and other minority-group students are clearly under-represented in our sample, as are males. Similarly, poor students, both academically and financially, and non-resident students (more difficult to locate by mail) are somewhat under-represented. There is little difference, however, between non-respondents and all EOG students as far as year in school and size of EOG are concerned. In the analysis, whenever necessary, whatever discrepancies have been found between non-respondents and all EOG students will be taken into account by controlling for those characteristics on which the two groups differ substantially.

The researcher can reduce bias by weighting or by controlling by significant variables on which respondents and non-respondents may differ. However, it is important to determine whether respondents differ substantially from the universe of clients of the social action program. We can test the representativeness of our sample by referring to the Fiscal-Operations data, submitted to the U.S. Office of Education in August 1969 by every institution participating in the EOG program. The tape contains information about financial aid packaging by race--the characteristic which most differentiated our respondents from non-respondents. Blacks and other minority group students are somewhat under-represented in our sample if we restrict the comparison to students for whom data were supplied by the financial aid officer. This is not so, however, if we compare the racial and ethnic background of our respondents with Fiscal-Operations Data for all students receiving EOG's in 1968-69 (Table 2.8).

TABLE 2.7

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS REPORTED BY FINANCIAL AID OFFICE FOR FOR RESPONDING AND NON-RESPONDING STUDENTS

Selected Characteristics	Total FAO Sample* (10,166)	Responding Students (8,078)	Non-Responding Students (2,088)
Race			
Indian, Oriental, Spanish	7.3%	6.7%	9.4%
Negro	24.8	21.0	39.6
White	67.9	72.4	51.0
Sex			
Male	48.2%	46.0%	55.8%
Female	51.8	54.0	44.2
Student's Quartile Placement (H.S.)			
Bottom Quartile	4.8%	3.7%	9.1%
3rd Quartile	11.7	10.4	16.9
2nd Quartile	26.2	25.6	29.1
Top Quartile	57.3	60.2	45.0
Gross Family Income			
Under $3000	25.7%	24.6%	30.0%
$3000-4499	22.5	22.4	22.8
$4500-5999	22.2	22.2	21.8
$6000-7499	16.4	17.0	14.0
$7500 or more	13.3	13.8	11.3

TABLE 2.7--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Total FAO Sample* (10,166)	Responding Students (8,078)	Non-Responding Students (2,088)
Student Residence Classification			
Resident	65.9%	67.3%	60.8%
Non-resident	34.1	32.7	39.2
Amount of EOG			
Less than $400	21.8%	21.4%	22.9%
$400-599	34.1	34.5	32.2
$600-799	23.4	24.2	21.7
$800-999	11.6	12.3	12.6
$1000	9.2	9.0	10.6
Year in School			
Freshman	34.5%	34.5%	34.1%
Sophomore	28.0	28.1	27.9
Junior	21.2	21.6	19.9
Senior	15.8	15.5	17.3
Other	.4	.3	.8

*Throughout this report we use the term "Student Sample" to refer to all students responding to the questionnaire and "FAO Sample" to refer to those students for whom data have been received from the financial aid officer. This last group includes both respondents and non-respondents to the student questionnaire. The term "FAO Respondents" includes students for whom data from both sources are available.

TABLE 2.8

RACE AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF SELECTED GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS AND OF ALL 1968-69 RECIPIENTS

Race	FAO Sample Students (10,166)		FAO EOG Respondents (8,053)	Question-naire Respondent (9,637)		All 1968-69 EOG Recipients Fiscal-Operations Reports (253,811)	
Black	24.8		21.0	22.0		23.0	
Indian	.3	7.3	6.7	.5	8.8	.4	6.6
Oriental	.9			1.0		1.0	
Spanish	6.1			7.3		5.2	
White	67.9		72.4	69.2		70.5	

Table 2.8 clearly shows that the race and ethnic background of our respondents and of all 1968-69 EOG recipients are quite similar. While our respondents and non-respondents, therefore, may differ from each other on selected items,[11] our respondents do not differ to an appreciable extent from the universe, that is, from all students receiving EOG's. In subsequent chapters we shall speak of the "EOG student" with a fair degree of confidence that our sample is generally representative of all EOG recipients.

---

[11] For a relevant discussion of non-response among ex-high school students, see Vincent, Clark E., "Socio-Economic Status and Familial Variables in Mail Questionnaire Responses," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 69, 1964, pp. 647-53.

CHAPTER THREE

"THE EOG STUDENT"

Introduction

Federal student financial aid programs in general, and the EOG program in particular, have increasingly placed their emphasis on targeting funds for students of exceptional financial need. Recent directives to financial aid officers have stressed the importance of concentrating EOG awards in the "under $6000" family income category. For the first time the Application Form for Fiscal Year 1972 required documentation of the extent to which monies would be allocated within specific income categories. The Presidential program recently presented to legislators who are drafting the new Higher Education Bill reiterates the need to channel these funds to the lowest income groups.[1]

A description, therefore, of the socio-economic characteristics of the EOG students in our sample is one means of assessing program success. What proportion of students receiving these awards come from families with incomes under $6000? What percentage are from deprived minority group backgrounds? How many would have been unable to attend college without financial aid? What proportion of EOG recipients have not planned to continue their education past high school? Answers to these and related questions will be presented in this chapter as one means of ascertaining the extent to which EOG funds have been allocated to students of "exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means of their own or their families . . . "[2] would have been unable to pursue their education beyond high school.

---

[1] See, e.g., The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. V, No. 21 (March 1, 1971), p. 1.

A description of "the EOG student," however, is not in itself evidence--even were we to find a large proportion of low-income, minority background recipients--of program success. There must be some yardstick against which to compare EOG students' socio-economic characteristics to assess whether they differ from the average college student. Unfortunately, those who drafted the request for the proposal decided not to include a control group of students not receiving EOG's in the study design. In 1969, however, the American Council on Education (ACE) collected data from a nationwide sample of college freshmen.[3] We included several items from the ACE instrument in our questionnaire so that we might compare the EOG freshman recipient with the national norms. Accordingly, selected relevant characteristics of these two groups are contrasted in order to ascertain whether students to whom EOG federal monies are being channeled do constitute a specially needy group.

---

[2] Higher Education Act, p. 1.

[3] Creager, J.A., Astin, A. W., Boruch, R. F., Bayer, A. E., and Drew, D. E., National Norms for Entering College Freshmen--Fall 1969.

Section I. "The EOG Student"

1. Income

To what extent are EOG's being awarded to low-income students? Table 3.1 presents income data from two sources: the student himself and the financial aid officer. It is interesting to note that more than 10 per cent (1,096) of these students cannot estimate their family income and another 3 per cent (309) did not answer the question.* It is also interesting that, despite increasing emphasis on targeting awards to students whose family incomes are under $6000, almost two-fifths of the students (39 per cent) report family incomes above this amount.

TABLE 3.1

FAMILY INCOME OF EOG STUDENTS

Family Income	Student Sample (1)	FAO Sample (2)	FAO Reported Income for Students Not Indicating Amount (3)
Under $3000	19.3%	25.7%	32.4%
$3000-4499	21.1	22.5	19.2
$4500-5999	21.3	22.2	20.2
$6000-7499	17.2	16.4	16.0
$7500 or more	21.9	13.3	12.2
(n)	(8,384)	(9,681)	(1,038)
Don't know**	(1,096)	-	-
No answer**	(309)	(485)	(87)

*Robert Berls of Office of Program Planning and Evaluation has informed us that this is the same percentage as reported for the ACE sample of college freshmen.

**See column 3 for Financial Aid Officer reported income.

Perhaps full credence should not be given to the student's response to this question. Several financial aid officers with whom we spoke noted that students, especially those from disadvantaged homes, are not reliable reporters of family income. It is possible, therefore, that many students were "guessing." Financial aid officers may be more reliable reporters of student family income since their data are based on information obtained through the Parents' Confidential Statement or directly from income tax reports. Accordingly, most of the data to be presented, unless otherwise specified, will be based on income as reported by the financial aid officer.

If we compare student and financial aid officer reports of family income we find that 62 per cent according to the student, but 70 per cent according to the financial aid officers, of the EOG recipients come from families with annual incomes of less than $6000.[4] A comparison of student and aid officer responses, category by category, reveals that there is an almost perfect match between the two sets of responses except for the highest and the lowest income categories. The Division of Student Financial Aid has noted a striking rise in the numbers of independent students, that is, students from whom no parental contribution is expected. It may be that some of the students who report family incomes in the higher ranges have been classified as independent students by the financial aid officer and that this accounts for the discrepancy in Table 3.1. Table A3.6 in Appendix A shows that among independent students, 42 per cent of those reporting family incomes above $6000 are classified by the financial aid officer in the "under $3000" category. Among parent-supported students the corresponding figure is 5 per cent. Or, stated differently, among independent students 37 per cent of those whose income is reported by the financial aid officer as under $3000 state that their family income exceeds $6000. Again, the corresponding figure is 10 per cent for parent-supported students. In other words, it appears that in some cases financial aid officers are reporting the income available to the student; in other cases the figure represents the student's family income.

---

[4] A spokesman for the U.S. Office of Education recently reported that figures on the operation of student-aid programs last year indicated that 70 to 76 per cent of the monies expended went to students from families with incomes of $6000 or below. See The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. V, No. 7 (November 9, 1970), p. 3.

It is recognized that many students, because of age, marital status, family relationships, or other factors, may come from a high income home but be unwilling to accept or unable to expect any parental assistance in attending college. We assume that FAO's are only awarding EOG's to students who can legitimately be classified as independent.[5] However, it is important to know the actual family background from which these independent students stem. The under $3000 category may be blurring the true picture for it may include (1) students with family income under $3000; (2) independent students with family income under $3000; (3) independent students with resources under $3000, but from families whose incomes are well into five figures. Still, even the figures provided by financial aid officers indicate that almost 30 per cent of EOG recipients come from families with annual incomes above $6000. This is a rather high proportion of students who may not be exceptionally needy. Perhaps such students are receiving lower EOG awards, or there are more dependents in their families; perhaps they more frequently have other siblings attending college at the same time. We can only speculate on the last possibility; we do have data, however, to test the others.

---

[5] Table A3.2 in Appendix A confirms that independent students generally are older, married or divorced, come from fatherless families, and in other respects resemble the archtypical disadvantaged student. We recommend, therefore, that even for independent students, gross family income data be collected in order to obtain a clearer picture of the kinds of backgrounds from which all financially aided students stem.

Table 3.2 examines selected characteristics of EOG students, holding income constant. It can be seen that part of the explanation of why EOG's are awarded to some students in the "above $6000" category is that these students are more likely to attend more expensive institutions and to live on campus.

There is a strong inverse relationship between family income and size of the EOG award;[6] the average EOG for students in the highest income group is $106 less than that of the lowest income group student. Similarly, the number of dependents in the EOG recipient's family is directly related to family income. This too may account for the eligibility of the higher income student for an EOG.

---

[6] This relationship is especially pronounced for students attending private institutions: the average EOG award is close to $700 for the lowest income group and only $523 for students with family incomes of over $7500. It is interesting that the mean dollar amount of the 1969-70 EOG as reported by the student is only $22 less than that reported by the financial aid officer. In other words, students are aware of the amount of money they are receiving through this federally funded source.

TABLE 3.2

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF EOG STUDENTS BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

Selected Characteristics	Annual Family Income (as reported by Financial Aid Officer)				
	Less than $3000	$3000-5999	$6000-7499	$7500-8999	$9000 or more
1. Mean EOG award	$586 (2,478)	$573 (4,306)	$545 (1,591)	$490 (791)	$477 (491)
2. Mean amount of student's financial aid package	$1206 (1,825)	$1217 (3,325)	$1226 (1,267)	$1176 (614)	$1245 (399)
3. Percentage receiving non-state scholarships	18.1% (2,485)	24.5% (4,320)	29.9% (1,591)	27.4% (792)	31.2% (493)
4. Percentage with guaranteed loan	7.6% (2,485)	10.5% (4,320)	13.3% (1,591)	13.3% (792)	16.2% (493)
5. Mean number of dependents in student's family	3.0 (2,232)	3.6 (4,247)	4.4 (1,571)	5.2 (783)	5.8 (487)
6. Mean tuition and fees in student's school	$639 (2,414)	$768 (4,154)	$868 (1,533)	$972 (754)	$1054 (474)
7. Percentage living on campus	61% (2,424)	66% (4,239)	71% (1,546)	71% (771)	70% (482)

Although their tuition and fees are substantially higher than those of the low-income students, students from higher income families receive about the same total amount of financial aid. The source of their aid, however, is more likely to be a scholarship or guaranteed loan.

In sum, 70 per cent of the EOG students come from families with annual incomes below $6000. The student whose family income exceeds $6000 receives a lower EOG and tends to have a large number of dependents in his family.

Since the emphasis on recruiting students from the very lowest income groups is increasing, it may be expected that in the next several years this group will constitute a larger proportion of student bodies at different institutions. Accordingly, it becomes of more than academic interest to examine the characteristics, attitudes, and expectations of very low-income students to see if they differ from those of the student from relatively less indigent families. Table 3.3 presents selected demographic, financial, academic and attitudinal characteristics of the EOG students from each income category.

It can readily be seen that these recipients are hardly a homogeneous group. Table 3.3 reveals that for almost every item presented family income is a differentiating factor. The first section of Table 3.3 reveals that almost half of the lowest income students come from southern or border states and are more likely to have grown up on a farm, ranch, or reservation. Similarly, they are very frequently the first in the family--even with older siblings--to attend college.

TABLE 3.3

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC, ACADEMIC, FINANCIAL, AND ATTITUDINAL CHARACTERISTICS OF EOG STUDENTS BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

Selected Characteristics	Annual Family Income (as reported by Financial Aid Officer)				
	Less than $3000	$3000-5999	$6000-7499	$7500-8999	$9000 or more
Demographic					
1. Permanent residence in South and Border states	44.1% (2,428)*	37.4% (4,195)	28.5% (1,546)	22.9% (756)	20.3% (478)
2. Grew up on a farm, ranch or reservation	26.2%[a] (1,884)[a]	22.3% (3,426)	17.5% (1,298)	14.3% (643)	9.7% (411)
3. First in family to attend college[b]	43.4 (1,372)	34.6 (2,314)	28.3 (795)	26.6 (376)	21.2 (245)
4. Black students	32.6 (2,359)	24.8 (4,119)	18.9 (1,491)	13.4 (756)	13.5 (473)
5. Other minority background students	10.2 (2,359)	6.8 (4,119)	5.5 (1,491)	4.3 (756)	3.8 (473)
6. Head of household unemployed	18.6 (1,796)	8.0 (3,311)	2.8 (1,271)	1.7 (632)	2.0 (403)
Academic					
1. Ranked in bottom half of high school class	19.1 (1,599)	16.5 (3,154)	14.8 (1,229)	10.7 (616)	14.4 (397)
2. Mean SAT-Verbal	448 (849)	465 (1,781)	489 (731)	509 (374)	511 (255)
3. Not enrolled in college preparatory program in high school	47.3% (1,848)	39.6% (3,377)	32.1% (1,291)	27.5% (639)	22.3% (404)

---

[a] To be read as follows: 26.2% of those in the "Less than $3000" income category grew up on a farm, etc., compared to 9.7% of those in the '$9000 or more" category.

[b] Limited to EOG recipients with older siblings.

*The numbers in parentheses represent the total on which percentages are based.

TABLE 3.3--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Annual Family Income (as reported by Financial Aid Officer)				
	Less than $3000	$3000-5999	$6000-7499	$7500-8999	$9000 or more
Academic (cont'd)					
4. Less than half of high school class went to college	59.8% (1,873)	55.0% (3,409)	55.0% (1,292)	50.8% (640)	47.2% (409)
5. Decided during or after senior year in high school to go to college	24.4 (1,874)	17.1 (3,413)	13.1 (1,310)	12.6 (644)	10.2 (413)
6. Participated in Upward Bound or Educational Talent Search	6.8 (1,903)	5.5 (3,452)	4.2 (1,318)	2.3 (650)	2.2 (415)
7. "High risk" students	14.5 (2,280)	10.8 (4,039)	9.9 (1,503)	5.8 (747)	7.4 (461)
8. Receive one or more supportive service	20.2 (2,485)	16.1 (4,320)	14.5 (1,591)	10.2 (792)	9.5 (493)
9. Mean GPA in college	2.4 (1,955)	2.5 (3,313)	2.5 (1,276)	2.6 (658)	2.6 (425)
Financial Items					
1. Found out eligible for financial aid after graduating from high school	36.7% (1,873)	26.5% (3,398)	22.3% (1,301)	22.2% (641)	17.8% (409)
2. Most important source of information about financial aid was parents or other relatives	14.0 (1,788)	18.3 (3,245)	20.6 (1,246)	23.4 (612)	25.3 (396)
3. Most important source of information about financial aid was college officer or college friends	23.5 (1,788)	20.0 (3,245)	19.3 (1,246)	17.8 (612)	15.9 (396)
4. Parents pay none of college expenses	57.2 (1,855)	45.8 (3,389)	39.9 (1,289)	40.9 (636)	42.2 (412)

TABLE 3.3--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Annual Family Income (as reported by Financial Aid Officer)				
	Less than $3000	$3000-5999	$6000-7400	$7500-8999	$9000 or more
Financial Items (cont'd)					
5. Academic program most important in choosing college	20.8% (1,734)	26.4% (3,204)	28.3% (1,222)	29.2% (603)	28.5% (390)
6. Low cost or availability of financial aid most important in choosing college	55.4% (1,734)	48.6% (3,204)	49.2 (1,222)	45.8 (603)	42.4 (390)
7. Would have been unable to attend college without financial aid	49.7% (1,877)	40.0% (3,395)	32.0 (1,295)	27.2 (637)	30.9 (408)
Attitudinal					
1. Borrowing to pay for college should be a last resort	46.8% (1,830)	50.2% (3,346)	52.0 (1,295)	52.4 (637)	55.1 (401)
2. Most important purpose of college is to develop job or career skills	58.9% (1,817)	56.9% (3,335)	55.7 (1,276)	52.8 (631)	48.0 (402)
3. Expect to go on to graduate school	55.9% (1,643)	54.0% (2,949)	57.5 (1,141)	53.3 (552)	56.5 (363)
4. Expect to enter a "high prestige" occupation[a]	21.6 (1,862)	22.4 (3,349)	24.2 (1,281)	28.4 (635)	22.2 (406)

[a] The professions, such as law, medicine, college teaching, engineering.

Finally these students more often come from minority group backgrounds; in fact 33 per cent of this group are black students.

These demographic characteristics which differentiate the higher from the lower income students are themselves related to a number of other characteristics of EOG recipients; it is not surprising, therefore, to find that higher and lower income EOG students differ on various other traits. For example low income EOG students are more likely than higher income ones to come from the bottom half of their high school class and to have lower SAT-V scores; they are twice as likely to have followed a non-college preparatory curriculum in high school; they tend more often to come from high schools where less than half of the seniors went on to college; they themselves more frequently decided only during or after their senior year to attend college. It is not surprising, therefore, that they have also more often been participants in programs such as Upward Bound or Educational Talent Search, and that they were twice as likely to have been admitted to college as "high risk" students and to have received remedial or other supportive services once enrolled.

The late decision of the lowest income students to apply to college is paralleled by their even later realization of their eligibility for financial aid: more than twice the proportion of the lowest (37 per cent) as the highest (18 per cent) income EOG students discovered that they were eligible for financial aid only after graduating from high school.

That many of the lowest income students are unaware of their eligibility for financial aid during high school has implications for the EOG program. Many financial aid officers pointed out that early applicants for financial aid receive preference while late applicants often find the institution without funds. Late application may mean either no EOG or a smaller grant. In fact, the mean EOG of students who found they were eligible only after high school was $540; for the student who realized he was eligible for aid before the senior year, the mean EOG was $583. Similarly, George Nash reports that the chances of a low-income student's attending college are considerably reduced if he has not heard about the availability of financial aid before his senior year in high school.[7]

All of this points to the obvious need for more intensive information programs during the early high school years to make students aware both of the educational opportunities and financial assistance available to them. The higher income student has generally discovered that he is eligible for financial aid by this time through parents and other relatives. His counterpart in the lowest income group, however, finds out only after high school and must rely upon college officials or friends for this information. Any marked success in attracting low income students to college, therefore, necessitates energetic, comprehensive recruitment during the early high school years. Built into the EOG legislation are directives to colleges to engage in such programs; as will be shown in a subsequent chapter, many schools have instituted these programs with apparent success. Our findings indicate, however, the need for increasing effort to reach the lowest income student during the first two years of high school.

---

[7] Nash, George, "The Current Status of Financial Aid Administration," Association of College Admissions Counselors Journal, Vol. 13, No. 2 (1969).

It is not surprising to find, in Table 3.3, that 57 per cent in the lowest income group but 42 per cent of those in the highest, report that parents contribute no part of their college expenses. In fact, 50 per cent of the former, compared to only 30 per cent of the latter, state that they would have been unable to attend any college had they not received financial aid. Similarly, the student from the lowest income category is less likely to have chosen his college for academic, but more likely for financial reasons, than his counterparts from the higher income groups.

Interestingly, these consistent demographic, academic and financial differences between EOG students from different income levels are not translated into corresponding attitudinal differences at the college level. The lower income EOG recipient is somewhat more vocationally oriented; he is more likely than is the higher income EOG student to cite preparation for job or career as the most important purpose of college. However, educational, income, and occupational expectations are strikingly similar, regardless of income.

We have no way of knowing the extent to which the lower income student, who might enter college with academic and financial handicaps, will attain his educational and occupational objectives. Our data suggest, however, that a successful financial aid program cannot rest upon the laurels of recruitment but must expend considerable resources upon minimizing attrition rates and maximizing the possibility that these students will obtain these goals.

It is clear that demographic, financial, academic and some attitudinal differences obtain between higher and lower income EOG recipients. As institutions are increasingly successful in recruiting specially deprived high school youngsters for college, it can be expected that they will be gradually changing the character of the college campus. Clark has commented upon the fact that the old "collegiate" student sub-culture is rapidly giving way to vocational, academic, and non-conformist sub-cultures. He notes that extension of higher educational opportunities to the working classes is hastening the replacement of the collegiate sub-culture by vocationalism.[8]

Clark was writing in the early 1960's, before tne advent of the massive federally funded student financial aid programs, including EOG. Today, as our data indicate, vocationalism is winning the day: almost three-fifths of the EOG recipients, 56 per cent, consider the development of job and career skills to be the most important purpose of college.[9] Academic goals are most important to only 28 per cent of these students. The importance of the academic goal decreases and that of the vocational increases as we go down the income scale to the lowest income category.[10] It appears that Clark's prognosis of the dominance of the vocational sub-culture on the college campus (especially the junior college) is becoming a reality today. It appears further that increasing emphasis on recruitment of the specially financially needy student will tip the scales even further away from the academic and toward the vocational emphasis. Curriculum development, faculty recruitment, student-faculty relationships--these are but a few of the areas which may be drastically altered by the changing goals and emphases of students. Further research might well be directed to faculties on different types of campuses in order to assess the possible implications of the increasing enrollments of vocationally-oriented students.

---

[8] Clark, B., Educating the Expert Society, Chandler Publishing Company, California, 1962.

[9] A national sample of college students in 1962 was asked a similar question and 33 per cent selected vocational or career preparation as the most important goal of college. See Bowers, W., Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York, 1964.

[10] The relationship between emphasis on vocationalism and income is reduced when examined within different institutional contexts. Vocationalism is highest in the public two-year school, lowest in the

---

private university. (See Table below.)

PERCENTAGE OF EOG STUDENTS CHOOSING VOCATIONAL GOAL
AS MOST IMPORTANT BY INCOME AND BY TYPE-
CONTROL OF INSTITUTION THEY ATTEND

Type-Control of Institution	Income of Student					
	Under $3000	$3000 5999	$6000 7499	$7500 8999	$9000 or more	All Students
Public University	55.5% (449)	55.9% (814)	53.1% (352)	56.4% (181)	50.0% (104)	55.0% (1,900)
Private University	48.0% (75)	47.4 (192)	46.7 (90)	49.1 (57)	31.1 (45)	46.0 (459)
Public 4-year	63.2% (646)	62.2 (997)	62.3 (329)	59.5 (126)	58.0 (81)	62.2 (2,179
Private 4-year	50.7 (422)	52.8 (976)	52.4 (416)	45.9 (220)	46.8 (154)	51.2 (2,188)
Public 2-year	72.2 (180)	60.6 (254)	70.3 (64)	66.7 (36)	44.4 (18)	65.4 (552)
Private 2-year	75.6 (45)	60.8 (102)	56.0 (25)	27.3 (11)	- (0)	61.7 (183)

2. Race

Table 3.3 revealed that there is a strong relationship between income and race; the percentage of black students is higher in the lowest than in the other income categories. This is hardly surprising--success in recruiting students of exceptional financial need is bound to bring more black students onto the college campus since blacks are substantially over-represented in the lowest income levels of the population. In this section we turn to an analysis of the characteristics of minority group students in the EOG sample.

Table 3.4 reveals that one-third of the EOG recipients in our sample come from minority group backgrounds; 25 per cent are black, 6 per cent Spanish-surnamed Americans, 1 per cent Orientals or American Indians. The remaining 68 per cent are white. The proportion of minority students in the EOG population is actually double that in the overall American college population. A comparison of EOG freshmen with a national sample of college freshmen (see Table 3.6) shows that Indians and Orientals are receiving financial aid in proportion to their representation in this college population. Black students, however, constitute only 6 per cent of all college freshmen, but 25 per cent of EOG students.

Assuming that the sample is representative, an interesting finding in Table 3.4 is that between the academic years 1968-69 and 1969-70, there has been an increase in the proportion of minority group students receiving EOG's: 29.6 per cent in 1968-69 compared to 32.1 per cent in 1969-70. Since predominantly black schools were somewhat less likely to return completed Student Data Forms (from which the data on race were obtained) the figures in Table 3.4 probably underestimate the proportion of minority students in the program in 1969-70. The increase since 1968-69, therefore, may have been even greater than 2.5 per cent.

TABLE 3.4

RACIAL AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF FAO SAMPLE AND EOG UNIVERSE

Racial and Ethnic Background	In EOG Sample	All EOG Recipients 1968-69
	Percentage	Percentage
American Indian	.3%	.4%
Oriental American	.9	1.0
Spanish-surnamed American	6.1	5.2
Black	24.8	23.0
White	67.9	70.6
TOTAL	(9,623)	(253,811)

In the past, the black student who found his way to college tended to come from a relatively comfortable middle-class family.[11] He was hardly the student of "exceptional financial need" toward whom the EOG program is targeted. An examination of the characteristics of minority group students will help to assess whether the benefits of post-secondary education have now become available to the minority student who stems from the poverty of the urban ghetto, the Western reservation, the rural South.

---

[11] Wisdom, P. and Shaw, K., "Black Challenge to Higher Education," Educational Record, Fall, 1969, p. 352.

Table 3.5 examines selected demographic, academic, financial and attitudinal characteristics of EOG students, holding race constant. It can readily be seen that the very same differences which obtained for students in varying income categories (see Table 3.3) hold for students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Rather than review Table 3.5 item by item, therefore, we shall note some of the more salient differences.

TABLE 3.5

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF EOG STUDENTS BY RACE AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Selected Characteristics	Race and Ethnic Background				
	American Indian	Black	Oriental American	Spanish Surnamed	White
Demographic					
1. Mean family income	$3751 (30)	$4162 (2,162)	$4759 (78)	$3965 (532)	$5055 (6,193)
2. Family head a laborer or unemployed	54.6% (22)	45.1% (1,490)	27.9% (68)	46.7% (388)	21.0% (5,358)
3. Mother or grandparent family head	45.9% (24)	36.0 (1,570)	- (72)	21.1 (404)	18.9 (5,421)
4. Father had less than 8 years education	20.8% (24)	20.9 (1,518)	17.4 (69)	42.1 (377)	7.8 (5,409)
5. Mother had less than 8 years education	16.0% (25)	8.5 (1,568)	25.0 (72)	36.2 (403)	4.1 (5,456)
6. First sibling in family to attend college (has older sibling)	25.0% (20)	42.8 (1,146)	28.6 (49)	39.9 (306)	32.2 (3,551)

TABLE 3.5--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Race and Ethnic Background				
	American Indian	Black	Oriental American	Spanish Surnamed	White
7. Permanent residence in South or Border states	50.0% (32)	58.6% (2315)	2.6% (76)	18.7% (578)	30.5% (6340)
8. Grew up on farm, ranch, reservation, small town	72.0% (25)	36.4% (1588)	18.1 (72)	49.0 (412)	54.9 (5472)
9. Grew up in a large city	12.0 (25)	28.3 (1588)	45.8 (72)	17.7 (412)	10.6 (5472)
Academic					
1. Enrolled in non-college preparatory program in high school	52.2% (23)	51.5% (1555)	71.8% (71)	39.4% (398)	65.0% (5423)
2. Ranked in bottom half of high school class	9.0% (22)	25.9% (1541)	24.5% (48)	24.5% (331)	12.7% (4994)
3. Mean Verbal SAT score	379 (10)	371 (963)	462 (54)	484 (189)	507 (2649)
4. Mean ACT score**	18.1 (9)	15.2 (544)	19.0 (11)	17.5 (175)	25.8 (2175)
5. Admitted as "high risk" student	15.4% (26)	27.5% (2222)	8.0% (75)	20.7% (526)	4.3% (6154)
6. Receiving one or more supportive service	30.3% (33)	35.3% (2390)	12.2% (82)	30.5% (584)	8.6% (6534)
7. Mean college GPA	2.3 (29)	2.2 (1752)	2.6 (58)	2.5 (422)	2.6 (5289)
Financial					
1. Financial aid or low cost most important in choosing college	60.9% (23)	61.5% (1418)	52.2% (69)	57.5% (374)	46.5% (3175)
2. Academic program most important in choosing college	8.7% (23)	18.3% (1418)	17.4% (69)	19.3% (374)	27.8% (3175)

**National mediam ACT score is approximately 22.5.

TABLE 3.5--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Race and Ethnic Background				
	American Indian	Black	Oriental American	Spanish Surnamed	White
3. Would have been unable to attend college without financial aid	75.0 (24)	51.8 (1578)	21.1 (71)	48.5 (412)	35.6 (5432)
4. Found out eligible for financial aid after high school	33.3 (24)	35.5 (580)	24.0 (71)	48.6 (410)	25.1 (5,445)
5. Mean total financial aid	$1166 (25)	$1284 (1530)	$1401 (71)	$1120 (395)	$1203 (5331)
6. Mean EOG	$534 (32)	$590 (2376)	$639 (82)	$574 (583)	$550 (6495)
7. Parents pay none of college expenses	47.8% (23)	43.3% (1559)	43.1% (72)	47.1% (403)	48.8% (5436)
Attitudinal					
1. Working at a term-time job should be avoided if at all possible	73.9 (23)	86.0 (1506)	81.7 (71)	84.6 (396)	78.7 (5340)
2. Most important purpose of college is:	(24)	(1499)	(66)	(397)	(5380)
To develop job or career skills	58.3	59.5	54.5	60.7	55.1
To obtain a broad general education	29.2	18.5	27.3	17.1	30.8
To acquire interest in world and community affairs	12.5	21.9	18.2	22.2	14.1
3. Expect to go on to graduate school	56.0 (25)	65.4 (1369)	62.1 (66)	47.2 (352)	52.4 (4761)
4. Expect to earn above $10,000 in five years	44.8 (24)	67.1 (1668)	59.1 (72)	44.0 (398)	45.6 (5267)
5. Expect to enter "high prestige" occupation	32.0 (25)	20.1 (474)	40.9 (66)	23.5 (387)	24.6 (5030)

(a) Demographic items

- The minority EOG student, as compared with the white one, has a lower mean family income.
- The head of his family is more than twice as likely to be a laborer or unemployed.
- A mother or grandparent is more frequently the family head.
- Both of his parents have had less education; the gap between mothers' and fathers' education is most noticeable among blacks, with mothers the better educated.[12]
- Even if he has an older sibling, the minority student is more likely to be the first child in his family to attend college.
- He tends to come more frequently from the Southern and border states.
- He is more likely to have grown up in a large city, less likely on a farm, ranch, or reservation (with the obvious exception of the American Indian).

(b) Academic

- Compared to the white student and other minority groups in most cases, the black EOG recipient is more likely to have been enrolled in a non-college preparatory program in high school, to have been in the bottom half of his high school class, and to have scored lower on SAT-V or ACT's.

---

[12] It is interesting that the Oriental-American's father has completed more years of schooling than the mother. Similarly it is among Orientals that the father is most frequently the family head. In general this group appears to resemble the whites on most items.

- Correspondingly, he is more likely to have been admitted as a "high risk" student and to be receiving special academic assistance.
- His college Grade Point Average (GPA) is lower than that of the white student.

(c) Financial

- Compared to the white student, the black EOG recipient is more likely to cite financial rather than academic factors as most important in choosing to attend his present college; in fact, he says more frequently that without financial aid he would have been unable to attend college.
- He found out that he was eligible for financial aid later than did the white student.
- His total financial aid package is higher, as is his EOG, although his parents are as likely to be paying part of his college expenses.

(d) Attitudinal

- The black student is somewhat more likely than the white one to state that work as a means of paying for college should be avoided.[13]
- The black student is somewhat more likely than the white one to cite vocational preparation as the most important purpose of

---

[13] Since black students are more likely to hold Work-Study jobs than are white students, their dislike of work as a means of raising part of the college expenses cannot be lightly dismissed. Attitudes toward different kinds of financial aid will be explored in Chapter Five.

college; he is much less likely to rank the obtaining of a broad general education as most important. Similarly, he is more likely than the white student to rank community interest as a prime goal.[14]

- The educational and income expectations of black students are much higher than those of white EOG recipients; 65 per cent of the former, but 52 per cent of the latter expect to continue their education past the B.A. degree. Similarly, 67 per cent of the black, but only 46 per cent of the white EOG students expect an annual income of more than $10,000 within five years of completing their education.
- These differences in expected education and income are not accompanied by differences in occupational expectations. In fact, black students are somewhat less likely than white ones to name the more "prestigious" occupations, that is, those associated with more educational preparation and with higher incomes.

Analysis of the income expectations of black and white students who plan to enter the same occupation, reveals that for each occupational category, the black student expects to earn more than does the white student.[15] The tendency for blacks to hold relatively unrealistic expectations has been documented in previous research;[16] and this group of EOG students is no exception. The implications for the program should not be minimized. A major brick in the American ideological wall is the notion that a higher education represents the key to occupational success, status, and high earnings. Furthermore, as our data attest, the _arriviste_ tends to espouse even more fervently and explicitly the values, norms, and behavior patterns of the already settled "natives." The financially and educationally deprived student, once he may have been encouraged to attend college by a successful recruitment program, expands his horizons and reaches for the stars. He aims as high _or higher_ than his relatively less deprived counterpart. However, as Ivar Berg has recently noted, "it has also been established, in analyses of wage differentials between whites and non-whites, that the latter will have lower earnings than whites in each category of educational development."[17]

---

[14] These different emphases among racial groups should not be minimized. They merit further attention and analysis for they may well underlie the current tension, dissension, and unrest on college campuses today.

[15] See Table A3.7 in Appendix A.

The gap between expectation and reality may produce frustration, anger, or feelings of personal failure for black students with high income expectations. There is obviously a need for extensive and realistic counselling programs which will apprise students of the occupational and income opportunities open to those who have completed two, four, or more years of higher education.

---

[16] See, e.g., Fichter, J. H., _Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges_, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1965.

[17] Berg, Ivar, _Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery_, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1970, p. 29.

The data presented indicate that differences between higher and lower income EOG recipients are strikingly similar to differences between white and non-white EOG students. This is hardly surprising, since the first item in Table 3.5 reveals that the non-white student has an average family income substantially below the white student. Almost two-fifths of the black students (38 per cent) compared to 23 per cent of the white ones, stem from families with incomes of less than $3000. When we talk about the black, or other minority student, we are talking about the low-income student. These socio-economic or other differences observed between whites and non-whites or between high and low income students are often compounded when we examine them for white and non-white students, holding income constant. Such an analysis points to the even greater academic and financial handicaps of the black student stemming, as he usually does, from a family of "exceptional financial need." Table A3.1 in Appendix A presents selected characteristics of white and black students, for each income category. A glance at that table reveals that with only minor exceptions, the differences between blacks and whites which were found in Table 3.5 still obtain when income is held constant. Within every income category, blacks continue to have handicaps. Compared to whites from similar income backgrounds, blacks are still more likely to have parents with fewer years of schooling,[18] to be the first among the oldest children in the family to attend college, to have been enrolled in a non-college preparatory curriculum in high school, to have graduated in the lower half of his high school class and to have chosen college for financial rather than academic reasons.

---

[18] This is significant since parental education has been found to be one of the strongest predictors of educational and occupational success.

Similarly, holding income constant, blacks are more likely than whites to have lower SAT-V or ACT scores. Although for every income category, the black student's grade point average is lower than that of his white counterpart, it is interesting that the differences are not as great as might be expected, given the academic handicaps with which the black student started.[19]

Similarly, the black student, regardless of income, decided later than the white one to attend college and found he was eligible for financial aid only after high school. Accordingly, we might expect his EOG or his total financial aid package to be smaller.[20] That financial aid personnel are concentrating their efforts on making it financially possible for the black student to attend college is suggested by the fact that holding income constant, the black student's EOG, as well as his total financial aid package, exceeds that of the white student.

In sum, the data we have presented in this section point to the fact that the very low income student enters college with many financial and academic handicaps. Similar handicaps are shared by black (and other minority) students. Nor can the handicaps of the latter be explained by poverty factors alone since differences between whites and blacks persist when income is held constant. At every income level, the black student is somewhat more handicapped than his white counterpart.

---

[19] Perhaps the relatively slight difference between black and white students' GPA's (an average difference of .4) is accounted for by the fact that black students, in every income category, are many times more likely than whites to have received one or more supportive service.

[20] See previous section for discussion of relationship of size of EOG to time of discovering eligibility for financial aid.

The double handicap of the minority, especially the black student, is compensated for, to some extent, however, for at every income level, the black student receives a higher EOG and a larger total financial aid package. Similarly, he is more likely than his white counterpart at the same income level to be provided with supportive services for overcoming his academic handicaps.

To assess the extent to which the provision of financial aid and supportive services has succeeded in keeping the minority/poverty student in college requires a longitudinal study. The data presented in this section suggest, however, that colleges have been enrolling low-income and minority students and have been providing them with academic and financial supports in proportion to their degree of academic and financial need.

It must be kept in mind that the exceptionally low-income/minority student represents at present a large proportion of EOG recipients. If schools increasingly direct their recruitment efforts and financial aid resources to this target group, they will soon represent an even larger proportion of the college population. Our data have pointed to the unique socio-economic and academic backgrounds of this target group, to the special academic and financial support they will require, and to the kinds of values and expectations they will hold. We suggest that these values and expectations be made explicit so that experienced guidance personnel can help students to make realistic educational and occupational choices and thus prevent the collapse of aspirations which acceptance into college may have raised to unreachable heights.

Section II. The EOG Student and National Norms

The preceding section has documented that most EOG students come from low-income families, that a substantial proportion stem from minority backgrounds, that most have parents who have not completed high school and come from homes where the family head is a semi- or unskilled worker or is unemployed. In sum, the portrait of the EOG student does appear to resemble that stipulated in the Higher Education Act of 1965, that is, the high school graduate of "exceptional financial need." Since parallel data were not collected from a control group, we can only assume that the socio-economic backgrounds of EOG students are different from those of the general college population. However, we can compare our sample, on several characteristics, with the ACE sample. Since the latter sample is composed only of freshmen, we present EOG data only for freshmen.

The figures in Table 3.6 speak for themselves. The EOG freshman is older: 40 per cent are 19 years or older, compared to 22 per cent of the national sample of freshmen. The EOG freshmen is much more likely to have grown up on a farm or in a small town, much less likely in a suburb. As noted in the previous section, 9 per cent of the national sample but 29 per cent of the EOG freshmen stem from minority backgrounds.

TABLE 3.6

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS FOR EOG FRESHMEN AND ACE SAMPLE

Selected Background Characteristics	EOG Freshmen	ACE Sample
1. Age	(2,559)	(270,000)
16 and under	.3%	.1%
17	2.0	3.8
18	58.0	74.0
19	30.6	14.3
20	4.5	2.1
21	1.5	1.0
22 or older	3.1	4.7
2. Residence while growing up	(2,559)	(270,000)
On a farm	20.2	9.7
In a small town	28.9	21.4
In a moderate size town or city	25.0	34.7
In a suburb of a large city	9.3	20.9
In a large city	16.6	13.3
3. Racial background	(2,548)	(270,000)
White	71.0	90.9
Black	24.1	6.0
American Indian	.4	.3
Oriental American	1.2	1.7
Other	3.3	1.1

Table 3.6--Continued

Selected Background Characteristics	EOG Freshmen .	ACE Sample
4. Father's education	(2,499)	(270,000)
Grammar school or less	32.7%	10.0%
Some high school	18.4	16.7
High school graduate	29.3	30.2
Some college	11.6	17.6
College graduate	4.4	16.8
Post-college education	3.7	8.8
5. Mother's education	(2,535)	(270,000)
Grammar school or less	22.0	6.4
Some high school	20.2	14.4
High school graduate	37.9	43.2
Some college	13.8	18.7
College graduate	3.9	14.0
Post-college education	2.2	2.8
6. Father's occupation	(2,494)	(270,000)
Professional or semi-professional	7.0	16.5
Business	16.1	29.5
Skilled worker	14.7	13.5
Semi-skilled worker	13.7	8.3
Unskilled worker	19.8	4.2
Unemployed	12.1	1.2
Other	16.6*	26.4**

*Includes clerical and sales, protective workers, and "don't know."

**Includes all of above plus artist, farmer/forester, military career.

Tabld 3.6--Continued

Selected Background Characteristics	EOG Freshmen	ACE Sample
7. Parental income	(3,319)	(270,000)
Under $4000	42.4%	5.5%
$4000-5999	33.7	9.0
$5000-7999	17.6	13.4
$8000-9999	5.4	16.6
$10,000-14,999	.9	28.7
$15,000 or more	.1	26.7

Only 20 per cent of the parents of the EOG freshmen have had any college, while for ACE freshmen the corresponding figures are 43 per cent of the fathers, 36 per cent of the mothers. Similarly, the families of EOG recipients rank substantially lower in the occupational and income structures of society. Almost 32 per cent of the EOG students, compared to only 5 per cent of the ACE freshmen, report that the head of their family is a laborer or unemployed. The vast majority (86 per cent) of ACE freshmen, compared to 30 per cent of EOG freshmen report a parental annual income over $6000.

Table 3.7 reveals that, on the surface, EOG freshmen are not as academically handicapped, in comparison with the national college population, as they are financially. In fact, their high school rank and average grades are above the national norms, they have as frequently applied to more than one college; their mean distance from home to college is about the same, their educational expectations are perhaps somewhat lower. On the other hand, more EOG than ACE students ranked in the bottom quartile of their high school class.

TABLE 3.7

A COMPARISON OF EOG FRESHMEN AND THE ACE SAMPLE ON SELECTED ACADEMIC ITEMS

Selected Academic Items	EOG Freshmen	ACE Sample
1. Average grade in high school	(2,570)	(270,000)
A or A+	7.1%	4.3%
A-	13.7	8.2
B+	23.6	15.6
B	21.3	23.7
B-	13.2	15.6
C+	12.9	16.9
C	7.8	14.7
Less than C	.4	.9
2. High school rank	(2,540)	(270,000)
Top quarter	52.3	50.7
Second quarter	27.0	26.6
Third quarter	13.7	18.2
Bottom quarter	7.0	4.7
3. Applications to other colleges	(2,562)	(270,000)
None	51.6	51.3
One or more	48.4	48.7

TABLE 3.7--Continued

Selected Academic Items	EOG Freshmen	ACE Sample
4. Miles from home to college	(2,459)	(270,000)
Less than 10 miles	19.5%	26.5%
11-50	26.4	24.4
51-100	18.2	13.1
101-500	30.3	26.3
501-1,000	3.6	5.3
Over 1,000 miles	2.0	4.3
5. Highest degree planned	(2,114)	(270,000)
Associate or less	5.6	10.7
B.A. or B.S.	49.2	38.2
M.A. or higher	45.2	51.1

These comparisons, however, must be interpreted with caution. That EOG students more frequently ranked in the top half of their high school class and reported higher grades during high school may be a function of the poorer quality high schools attended by this financially deprived group. The EOG student more frequently attended a small public high school in a rural area, a school in which less than half of the graduating class went on to college. He was competing in senior classes from which few went on to college and therefore would naturally tend to rank in the top half of his class and to receive higher grades. If we assume that many EOG students, especially blacks, attended high schools with lower academic standards, we may also assume that a grade of "A" or "A-" in such schools may not connote the same degree of academic achievement as the same grade in the academically demanding high school.[21]

Despite the limitations inherent in a comparison of our sample with ACE's national sample, the data presented confirm that EOG recipients constitute a group from a distinctively lower socio-economic background. When viewed against the yardstick of national norms, EOG's are being awarded, as stipulated in the original legislation and reiterated in subsequent amendments and directives, to high school graduates of exceptional financial need.

---

[21] See Fichter, op. cit., pp. 34-35, for a discussion of this point.

CHAPTER IV

THE EOG INSTITUTION

Until the advent of Federal aid programs for college students, there were few effective means for enabling disadvantaged students, particularly minority group students, to attend post-secondary educational institutions. As Wisdom and Shaw stated, "available scholarship money went to the very talented or to athletes."[1] The cost of a college education was generally well beyond the means of the working or lower-class family; even a tuition free education was not necessarily the answer since it meant postponing earning power which was essential to the survival of the family.

The economic barrier, however, was not the only one which excluded the black or other minority student from pursuing a higher education. Colleges have traditionally used such indices as college entrance test scores or high school rank for predicting academic success and for making admissions decisions. Despite the fact that performance on these indices is related to socio-economic background and is more a measure of what one has learned rather than of the potential for learning, colleges have persisted in using these indicators in making admissions decisions. EOG program directives have increasingly instructed institutional administrators that EOG's "are intended for students at all levels of academic performance, including those whose potential is not apparent from conventional measures. The primary criterion of student eligibility for an EOG is exceptional financial need, not scholarship."[2] An evaluation of the effectiveness of the EOG program, therefore, requires assessing the extent to which institutions have waived traditional academic criteria, have admitted "high risk" students, and then have provided these students with the financial aid necessary for them to "obtain the benefits of higher education."

---

[1] Wisdom, Paul E. and Shaw, Kenneth A., "Black Challenge to Higher Education," Educational Record, Fall 1969, p. 352.

The mandate of the EOG legislation, however, extends beyond providing financial aid to students seeking the benefits of higher education even to "high risk" students seeking such benefits. For another barrier to the admission to college of the economically deprived student has been the traditional assumption on the part of institutions of higher education that interested students should apply for admission. Those who apply for admission to college, however, are overwhelmingly from middle-class homes where familial aspirations have set high priority on a college education. The lower class youth is not nearly as likely, despite his academic ability, to plan to go to college.[3] His home may not have been one which generated motivation for college; his guidance counselor may not have advised or encouraged him to apply; in fact, he may have been placed upon entrance to high school in a non-college program with fellow-students having limited educational aspirations.

---

[2] U.S. Government Memorandum to Coordinators of Student Financial Aid, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, October 18, 1968, p. 6.

[3] See Jaffe and Adams, op. cit.

In other words, a student financial aid program which stops at the allocation of resources to provide financial assistance to college students has focused on only one of the barriers which have deprived students from disadvantaged backgrounds of the benefits of higher education.

The framers of the Higher Education Act of 1965, aware of this dilemma, built into the legislation directives that institutions identify exceptionally financially needy high school students (through such programs as Upward Bound and Educational Talent Search) and inform them of the availability of financial aid to help obtain a college education. Any evaluation of EOG, therefore, must consider not only the number and characteristics of students being assisted, but also the extent to which institutions of higher education are actively recruiting high school students of exceptional financial need.

Finally, recruiting and admissions must be accompanied by services which will insure the retention of students from exceptionally disadvantaged backgrounds. Students from non-college preparatory high school programs are not prepared to pursue regular college level courses; those from deprived cultural backgrounds may be lacking the motivational equipment and academic know-how to adjust to the demands of college curricula. Failure, after promises and visions of success, would be doubly disillusioning and might well cause alienation, self-doubt or anger. Recruitment and admission of the student of exceptional financial need, therefore, must go hand in hand with a firm program of supportive services. In this chapter we first describe the institutions of higher education participating in the EOG program and then examine the extent to which recruitment, admissions modifications, and supportive services are utilized in order to attract, admit, and retain the student of exceptional financial need.

Section I. A Description of Participating Institutions

As of July 1, 1969 there were 1,939 institutions of higher education participating in the EOG program.[4] A comparison of EOG schools with all institutions of higher education in the United States reveals that more than eight out of ten public, but seven out of ten private institutions are in the EOG program (Table 4.1). Reasons for the under-representation of private institutions will become evident in the course of the report.[5]

---

[4] Since that time additional schools have entered the program but these are not included in our sample.

[5] See especially Chapter Six.

TABLE 4.1

INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN EOG COMPARED WITH ALL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION BY CONTROL

Institutional Control	EOG Institutions		All Institutions*		Percentage in Program
	Percent [1]	(n) [2]	Percent [3]	(n) [4]	[2÷4]
Public	46.5%	(903)	42.3%	(1,079)	83.7%
Private	53.4%	(1,036)	57.7%	(1,472)	70.4%
All schools	100.0%	(1,939)	100.0%	(2,551)	76%

*American Council on Education, A Fact Book on Higher Education, Third issue, 1970, ACE, Washington, D.C.

TABLE 4.2

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE EOG PROGRAM AND OF ALL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION BY FEDERAL REGION

Federal Region (1970)	EOG Institutions Percent [1]	EOG Institutions (n) [2]	All Institutions Percent [3]	All Institutions (n) [4]	Percentage in Program [2÷4]
Region 1	9.2%	(179)	8.8%	(225)	79.6%
Region 2	10.7	(208)	11.1	(283)	73.5
Region 3	10.9	(211)	11.9	(303)	69.6
Region 4	17.3	(335)	17.3	(440)	76.1
Region 5	17.6	(342)	18.5	(472)	72.4
Region 6	8.7	(168)	8.3	(213)	78.9
Region 7	8.4	(163)	7.8	(200)	81.5
Region 8	4.0	(78)	3.4	(89)	87.6
Region 9	9.0	(175)	8.9	(227)	77.1
Region 10	4.1	(80)	3.5	(91)	87.9
All schools	100.0%	(1,939)	100.0%	(2,543)	

TABLE 4.3

AVERAGE TUITION AND FEES AND AVERAGE ROOM AND BOARD CHARGES IN EOG INSTITUTIONS AND IN ALL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Average Charges for:	EOG Institutions	All Institutions* (2,551)
Tuition and Fees		
Private	$1,440 (837)	$1,443
Public (in-state only)	346 (748)	314
Room and Board		
Private	958 (774)	990
Public	852 (451)	829

*American Council on Education, A Fact Book on Higher Education, Third Issue, 1970, ACE, Washington, D.C.

Institutional costs at EOG institutions are strikingly similar to the average costs at all public and private schools in the United States. Tuition and fees, as well as room and board costs seem to be slightly higher at the public EOG institutions than at all public institutions, slightly lower at the private EOG institutions than at all private institutions, but the differences are minimal.

More interesting than differences between EOG and all institutions are differences among EOG schools of various types. Table 4.4 presents some of these differences. First, it can be seen that predominantly black institutions comprise only 5 per cent of all EOG schools, but more than 10 per cent of public four-year institutions.

TABLE 4.4

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE EOG PROGRAM BY TYPE AND CONTROL

Selected Characteristics		All Institutions	Private Univ.	Public Univ.	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
1. Racial Composition	(n)	(1,939)	(67)	(131)	(814)	(305)	(155)	(467)
Predominantly white		95.0%	98.5%	99.2%	94.5%	89.2%	96.1%	97.9%
Predominantly black		5.0	1.5	.8	5.5	10.8	3.9	2.1
2. Full-time Undergraduate Enrollment	(n)	(1,601)	(65)	(128)	(803)	(304)	(142)	(460)
Under 1,000		41.2%	3.1%	8.6%	61.4%	11.2%	86.0%	52.6%
1,000 - 4,999		45.2	63.1	17.2	37.9	60.9	14.1	44.6
5,000 or more		13.6	33.8	74.2	.7	28.0	-	2.8
3. School Quality	(n)	(1,522)	(51)	(104)	(635)	(238)	(119)	(375)
High		25.1%	62.7%	26.9%	32.4%	30.3%	17.6%	6.1%
Medium		31.8	27.5	45.2	43.8	30.3	29.4	10.1
Low		43.1	9.8	27.9	23.8	39.5	52.9	83.7
4. Entry into the Program	(n)	(1,578)	(53)	(116)	(646)	(255)	(119)	(389)
1966 - 1967		70.3%	98.1%	88.8%	80.0%	87.8%	47.9%	40.4%
1967 - 1968 or later		29.7	1.9	11.2	20.0	12.2	52.1	59.6

Or, stated differently, almost one-third of the predominantly black schools are four-year public institutions.

As one might expect, the universities and public four-year schools are "large." The private four- and public two-year colleges have medium sized enrollments, and the two-year private schools are "small."

An approximate measure of "school quality"* was obtained by grouping responses to the question: "About what per cent of those who apply for admissions as freshmen are generally accepted?" into three categories, as follows:

50% or less:	High Quality
60 to 89%:	Medium Quality
90% or more:	Low Quality

The private university has the highest proportion of high quality schools; the public two-year college the lowest. The public university and private four-year college have similar proportions of high, medium, and low quality schools.

Seven out of ten schools entered the EOG program at its outset in 1966-67. This was true of less than half of the two-year colleges, especially the public ones. One of the reasons for the late entry of these institutions into the program is that many two-year community colleges have opened their doors only in the last several years. The availability of federal funds for construction loans, developing institution assistance, and financial aid programs has provided some impetus for the mushrooming of two-year community colleges.[6]

---

*It should be emphasized that the label "school quality." as used throughout this report, reflects only the "selectivity" of the institution and in no way implies other possible differences in quality among schools.

In Chapter Three, the characteristics of students in the EOG program were examined. It is apparent that EOG students differ as a group from the general college population; it was also seen that income and race are strong differentiators of academic, attitudinal and other student characteristics.

Common sense would suggest that EOG students are not randomly distributed among the six institutional types, but rather that factors such as income and race are strong predictors of where a student will apply, be admitted, attend. If this is the case, then we may expect that some kinds of institutions will have proportionately more, others proportionately fewer, of the archetype EOG student emphasized in the legislation, namely, the student of "exceptional financial need." Furthermore, we may also expect that institutions with higher proportions of exceptionally needy students, will face more severe problems of providing the financial and academic support which we found, in Chapter Three, was essential to overcome the handicaps with which such students enter college.

Table 4.5 presents data showing the demographic, academic, financial, and attitudinal characteristics of students in the six institutional types. The statistics speak for themselves, and quite eloquently. The two-year institutions, both public and private, followed rather closely by the four-year public college, have an overrepresentation of students with most of those characteristics which were seen to

---

[6] The implications of early versus late entry into the EOG program for program "success" will be discussed in Chapter Six.

TABLE 4.5

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS BY TYPE AND CONTROL OF INSTITUTION

Selected Student Characteristics		All Students	Private Univ.	Public Univ.	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
1. Demographic								
a. Sex: Percent male		46.6%	58.1%	51.1%	47.2%	39.5%	45.5%	47.1%
	(n)	(9,721)	(570)	(2,315)	(2,997)	(2,722)	(253)	(864)
b. Residence while growing up								
Farm or town		48.5%	24.8%	48.0%	44.1%	58.3%	54.2%	49.5%
Large city		16.8	34.9	15.5	18.1	12.8	13.1	17.2
	(n)	(9,686)	(570)	(2,304)	(2,986)	(2,713)	(251)	(862)
c. Race								
Black		24.8%	27.2%	17.6%	25.8%	29.8%	27.7%	22.2%
American Indian		.3	-	.5	.2	.2	3.6	.4
Oriental-American		.9	2.5	1.3	.7	.5	-	.2
Spanish		6.1	2.6	7.9	4.1	6.0	4.1	10.8
White		67.9	67.7	72.8	69.4	63.4	64.6	66.5
	(n)	(9,622)	(570)	(2,316)	(2,875)	(2,849)	(195)	(817)
d. Mean family income		$4775	$5410	$4841	$5172	$4374	$4225	$4287
	(n)	(9,458)	(591)	(2,377)	(2,717)	(2,806)	(217)	(750)
e. First sibling to attend college (has older sibling)		35.8%	27.5%	30.3%	35.0%	38.1%	48.1%	45.4%
	(n)	(6,476)	(356)	(1,511)	(1,942)	(1,867)	(187)	(613)

TABLE 4.5--Continued

Selected Student Characteristics		All Students	Private Univ.	Public Univ.	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
2. Academic								
a. Bottom half of high school class		16.5%	10.7%	10.1%	17.1%	14.9%	32.1%	40.6%
	(n)	(7,239)	(507)	(1,714)	(2,307)	(2,218)	(171)	(522)
b. Mean SAT-Verbal		471	543	500	470	425	435	408
	(n)	(4,125)	(439)	(746)	(1,890)	(769)	(91)	(190)
c. Mean ACT		23	30	24	26	22	20	22
	(n)	(2,994)	(91)	(780)	(586)	(1,203)	(73)	(261)
d. Non-college preparatory program in high school		38.5%	18.8%	34.1%	33.3%	45.5%	55.4%	54.5%
	(n)	(9,546)	(570)	(2,282)	(2,944)	(2,669)	(242)	(839)
e. Decided after high school to go to college		22.3%	12.8%	18.4%	19.5%	24.8%	36.1%	36.8%
	(n)	(9,444)	(561)	(2,261)	(2,916)	(2,645)	(244)	(817)
f. Admitted as "high risk" student		11.2%	8.9%	9.4%	9.6%	12.5%	17.9%	17.6%
	(n)	(9,447)	(571)	(2,384)	(2,824)	(2,677)	(223)	(768)
g. Mean cumulative GPA		2.50	2.66	2.57	2.48	2.47	2.39	2.33
	(n)	(7,970)	(439)	(2,093)	(2,309)	(2,449)	(168)	(512)
h. Received supportive services		16.2%	20.4%	10.9%	14.3%	18.5%	16.2%	28.3%[a]
	(n)	(10,163)	(627)	(2,543)	(2,939)	(2,990)	(235)	(829)

[a] A comparison of lines a and h permits an interesting preview of a subsequent section of this chapter. In the private university, the percentage receiving supportive services is almost double the percentage in the bottom half of their high school class. In the two-year schools the ratios are reversed.

TABLE 4.5--Continued

Selected Student Characteristics		All Students	Private Univ.	Public Univ.	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
3. Financial								
a. First heard eligible for financial aid after high school		29.2%	15.0%	23.5%	26.1%	32.6%	45.4%	50.4%
	(n)	(9,624)	(567)	(2,303)	(2,977)	(2,684)	(249)	(844)
b. Major factor in choosing college was:								
Financial aid or low cost		50.3%	45.8%	51.7%	42.7%	54.9%	52.4%	60.9%
Academic program		25.0	34.0	30.7	24.0	23.5	13.7	15.3
	(n)	(9,010)	(529)	(2,173)	(2,779)	(2,518)	(227)	(784)
c. Without financial aid, would have:								
Attended different college		24.6%	51.3%	20.0%	39.6%	12.9%	15.9%	7.1%
Been unable to attend college		40.1	24.1	36.9	35.4	47.4	52.0	48.6
	(n)	(9,609)	(565)	(2,295)	(2,962)	(2,690)	(252)	(855)
d. Mean EOG		$562	$703	$573	$638	$494	$518	$414
	(n)	(10,066)	(626)	(2,504)	(2,910)	(2,969)	(234)	(823)
e. Mean total financial aid		$1230	$1781	$1195	$1439	$1024	$1115	$924
	(n)	(9,363)	(542)	(2,246)	(2,884)	(2,635)	(234)	(822)

TABLE 4.5--Continued

Selected Student Characteristics		All Students	Private Univ.	Public Univ.	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
4. Attitudinal								
a. Grants to needy students of high academic promise		32.4%	37.9%	35.5%	31.6%	32.6%	23.4%	24.4%
	(n)	(9,604)	(565)	(2,296)	(2,966)	(2,682)	(252)	(843)
b. Work during school year should be avoided		81.0%	87.1%	84.5%	80.5%	79.1%	74.0%	77.8%
	(n)	(9,371)	(557)	(2,255)	(2,883)	(2,619)	(246)	(811)
c. Loans should be a last resort		50.8%	61.9%	49.3%	55.1%	44.2%	57.3%	50.8%
	(n)	(9,474)	(565)	(2,282)	(2,920)	(2,631)	(248)	(828)
d. Vocational preparation most important goal		55.8%	45.9%	54.0%	50.9%	61.1%	64.1%	64.7%
	(n)	(9,405)	(558)	(2,260)	(2,892)	(2,633)	(245)	(817)
e. Expect to go beyond B.A. or B.S.		49.1%	64.7%	50.3%	52.5%	48.3%	30.5%	31.9%
	(n)	(9,548)	(566)	(2,275)	(2,946)	(2,671)	(246)	(844)
f. Occupational expectation								
"High prestige" occupation*		24.1%	43.5%	31.5%	22.2%	18.4%	16.1%	18.6%
Elementary or high school teaching		35.3	18.6	29.4	35.9	45.5	33.5	27.6
	(n)	(8,918)	(512)	(2,089)	(2,761)	(2,540)	(236)	(780)

*See Table 3.3, p. 59 for examples of "high prestige" occupations.

constitute academic and financial handicaps. Or, stated differently, minority/low-income students, students with low high school rank and/or low test scores, students who planned only after high school to attend college, students who are classified as "high risk," students who are vocationally oriented, find their way most frequently to the two-year institutions, least often to the private university. The public four-year college, almost 40 per cent of whose EOG students are of minority background, runs a close third to the two-year institutions in the proportions of EOG students with severe academic and financial handicaps.

That the severely handicapped students, both academically and financially are more likely to be found in some institutional types rather than in others has implications not only for financial aid requirements of different kinds of institutions, but also for the degree to which different institutional types find it feasible to recruit, to admit, and to provide for the retention of these students.

In Chapter Five we present data on financial aid policies and practices of the six institutional types. In the remainder of this chapter we examine the extent to which different types of schools are actively recruiting disadvantaged students and are making effective provision for their admission and retention.

Section II. Recruitment

Active recruitment of students of exceptional financial need is expected of schools which participate in the EOG program. The legislation establishing and amending the program stipulated that institutions "make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths of exceptional financial need and to encourage them to continue their education . . . " and suggested various forms these efforts might take.

In this section we examine the extent to which this legislative mandate is being carried out by participating institutions.

1. The Extent of Recruitment

Almost half of the EOG institutions, as Table 4.6 indicates, have established special programs to recruit disadvantaged students. The private university is most active in this respect: 80 per cent have instituted such programs. Next come the public universities, more than two-thirds of whom have established special programs. The two-year schools, especially in the private sector, are least likely to have such programs; in fact, 30 per cent of both public and private two-year colleges state that they do not specifically attempt to recruit disadvantaged students.[7]

Schools which indicated that they had special programs were asked whether the individual administering the program also had other responsibilities or whether directing the program was his sole or primary responsibility. Most of these special recruitment programs are administered by a financial aid officer, registrar, dean of students, or some other college officer. At the public university and four-year college, however, the director of the program is generally

---

[7] The reasons for the absence or paucity of recruitment efforts on the part of many two-year institutions will be discussed subsequently.

TABLE 4.6

RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES OF EOG INSTITUTIONS BY TYPE AND CONTROL

Recruitment Activities		All Schools	Private Univ.	Public Univ.	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
1. Special recruitment program		46.5%	79.2%	67.5%	43.6%	52.9%	29.5%	41.6%
	(n)	(1,603)	(53)	(117)	(660)	(257)	(122)	(394)
2. Special recruitment director		41.1%	41.9%	69.2%	30.1%	52.2%	38.9%	38.2%
	(n)	(747)	(43)	(78)	(289)	(136)	(36)	(165)
3. Mechanisms used regularly								
a. Contact with high schools		70.5%	92.5%	73.5%	66.9%	73.6%	58.5%	74.4%
	(n)	(1,613)	(53)	(117)	(665)	(261)	(123)	(394)
b. Upward Bound or Educational Talent Search		42.0%	82.7%	67.5%	40.4%	53.7%	32.8%	26.9%
	(n)	(1,592)	(52)	(117)	(654)	(257)	(122)	(390)
c. Contact with community groups		43.9%	53.8%	43.6%	47.1%	36.8%	45.1%	41.4%
	(n)	(1,605)	(52)	(117)	(662)	(258)	(122)	(394)
d. Contact with ethnic organizations		26.7%	57.7%	35.0%	27.4%	23.3%	18.0%	24.0%
	(n)	(1,602)	(52)	(117)	(661)	(258)	(122)	(392)
e. Coordination with other colleges		21.8%	32.7%	27.6%	21.5%	25.0%	14.8%	19.3%
	(n)	(1,595)	(52)	(116)	(657)	(260)	(122)	(388)
f. Lower or waive admissions criteria		23.1%	44.0%	26.7%	24.5%	18.7%	16.0%	21.8%
	(n)	(1,569)	(50)	(116)	(660)	(257)	(119)	(367)

TABLE 4.6--Continued

Recruitment Activities		All Schools	Private Univ.	Public Univ.	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
g. Set aside institutional funds for disadvantaged students		37.3%	74.5%	43.5%	43.6%	28.0%	32.2%	27.9%
	(n)	(1,580)	(51)	(115)	(652)	(254)	(121)	(387)
4. Do not specifically attempt to recruit disadvanted		24.7%	7.5%	14.5%	23.8%	24.4%	29.3%	30.2%
	(n)	(1,620)	(53)	(117)	(667)	(262)	(123)	(398)
5. Factors limiting recruitment efforts								
a. Sufficient disadvantaged applicants		34.2%	13.2%	22.2%	28.2%	40.1%	39.0%	45.5%
b. Insufficient funds for recruiting		39.8	20.8	41.0	38.4	42.4	40.7	42.5
c. Insufficient funds for financial aid		51.4	49.1	43.6	62.1	45.8	48.8	40.7
d. Insufficient funds for supportive services		48.6	43.4	49.6	55.5	46.2	43.9	40.7
e. Curriculum too rigorous for such students		14.2	17.0	17.9	21.6	12.2	5.7	4.5
f. Difficult to adjust to climate		5.3	-	2.6	9.7	3.4	3.3	1.3
g. Don't want problems other schools have had		5.9	-	2.6	9.1	5.0	5.7	3.0
	(n)	(1,620)	(53)	(117)	(667)	(262)	(123)	(398)

a person whose sole responsibility is administering the program.[8] Section 3 of Table 3.6 indicates that private universities lead all of the other institutional types in the use of each recruitment device while the lowest utilizers of these mechanisms are the two-year colleges.

The most frequently utilized device for recruitment of disadvantaged students--and this is true for all institutional types--is regular contact with high school principals and guidance counselors in low-income areas. Conversations with admissions people during the site visits indicated that contact with high schools typically meant that an admissions officer or his proxy visited the high school and gave a little talk about the college and about the availability of financial aid. Some admissions or financial aid officers indicated that they spoke informally with guidance personnel in these low-income area high schools to get "an inside line" on their applicants.

All institutional types, but the four-year private school even more than the others, cite insufficient funds as a factor limiting or preventing recruitment efforts. Very few schools place the blame for limited recruiting efforts on a too rigorous curriculum, or on factors such as the school's unique religious or social climate. Nor do many say that they are concerned that bringing disadvantaged students onto the campus will be accompanied by "the same kinds of problems other schools have had." If these factors are mentioned, it is the private four-year institution which tends to consider them problems.

---

[8] In Chapter Seven we will examine the implications of different administrative styles for the success of these recruitment programs.

Whether the limitations mentioned by these institutions are legitimate or whether they constitute rationalizations for lack of motivation to recruit disadvantaged students is difficult to assess. It is interesting that private universities, whose curricula are generally more rigorous than those of most four-year colleges, do not cite this factor as frequently. Similarly in the more selective schools a rigorous curriculum is not cited as a limiting factor more frequently than by less selective schools. Furthermore, the more selective schools rarely give the religious or social climate, or fear of "problems" as limiting factors. The high quality schools are limited in their recruitment efforts rather by inadequate funds for financial aid or supportive services. (See Table A4.6, Appendix A.)

2. Limitations on Recruitment

Many schools report that they do not attempt to recruit disadvantaged students because they already have sufficient needy applicants. We might question, however, whether this is a legitimate reason or an ex post facto justification for lack of recruitment efforts. Our data suggest the former.

TABLE 4.7

PERCENTAGE OF EOG STUDENTS FROM MINORITY BACKGROUNDS BY FACTORS LIMITING RECRUITMENT

Recruitment Activities Limited by:	Percentage from Minority Background	
1. Sufficient applicants already		
Yes	36.3%	(3,121)
No	30.1	(6,220)
2. Inadequate funds for recruitment		
Yes	29.3	(3,550)
No	33.9	(5,791)
3. Inadequate funds for financial aid		
Yes	29.0	(4,754)
No	35.3	(4,587)
4. Inadequate funds for supportive services		
Yes	26.8	(4,670)
No	37.4	(4,671)
5. Curriculum too rigorous		
Yes	14.4	(1,441)
No	35.4	(7,900)
6. Religious/social climate		
Yes	8.9	(471)
No	33.4	(8,870)
7. Don't want problems other schools have had		
Yes	6.3	(347)
No	33.1	(8,994)

In schools which say they already have sufficient disadvantaged applicants, 36.3 per cent of their EOG recipients are black, Oriental, Indian, or Spanish-Americans; only 30 per cent in the other schools stem from minority backgrounds. In every other instance, as Table 4.7 indicates, the proportion of minority group students is less in schools which limit recruitment activities for other reasons.

Most significant, perhaps, is that the schools which state that they limit recruitment efforts for reasons other than lack of funds, are those which have only minimal proportions of minority students enrolled. It appears that these schools, many of which are denominational colleges with only small minority enrollments, are reluctant to increase the proportion of minority students on their campuses for fear of the academic, religious, or social problems which recruitment of such students might engender.

We believe that the widespread attention paid by the mass media to problems that many schools are having as a result of large influxes of minority students must be countered by widespread dissemination of the many successes at institutions which have opened their doors to the disadvantaged minority student.*

3. The Recruitment Index

Schools were classified as ranking high, medium, or low on a Recruitment Index constructed by totaling the number of mechanisms** regularly utilized by institutions. Table 4.8 presents the distribution of different types of EOG institutions on the Recruitment Index.

---

*See Egerton, J., State Universities and Black Americans: An Inquiry into Desegretion and Equity for Negroes in 100 Public Universities, Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia, 1969.

**See Table 4.6.

TABLE 4.8

RECRUITMENT INDEX SCORE BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics	Recruitment Index Zero	One	Two	Three or more	(n)
All schools	28.5%	27.6%	21.1%	22.8%	(1,617)
1. Type and control of institution					
Private university	5.7%	11.3%	22.6%	60.4%	(53)
Public university	14.5	24.8	25.6	35.0	(117)
Private four-year	27.2	27.0	21.3	24.5	(666)
Public four-year	26.3	32.1	19.8	21.8	(262)
Private two-year	38.2	27.6	22.8	11.4	(123)
Public two-year	37.9	29.0	18.7	14.4	(396)
2. Racial composition					
Predominantly white	29.7%	27.4%	20.6%	22.3%	(1,545)
Predominantly black	11.1	34.7	27.8	26.4	(72)
3. School quality					
High	20.2%	21.5%	22.3%	36.1%	(382)
Medium	26.9	29.8	20.3	23.0	(483)
Low	34.7	30.7	20.3	14.2	(654)
4. Size of EOG Program					
Small	34.6%	29.1%	19.3%	17.0%	(1,014)
Medium	22.7	24.9	23.5	28.9	(405)
Large	12.1	26.3	23.7	37.9	(198)

TABLE 4.8--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Recruitment Index				(n)
	Zero	One	Two	Three or more	
5. Federal Region					
Region 1	24.1%	24.1%	24.1%	27.7%	(141)
Region 2	20.1	20.8	22.9	36.1	(144)
Region 3	25.7	29.6	21.2	23.5	(179)
Region 4	34.9	31.3	21.6	12.2	(278)
Region 5	32.0	26.8	15.8	25.4	(291)
Region 6	43.4	30.1	14.7	11.9	(143)
Region 7	29.9	26.5	23.8	19.7	(147)
Region 8	23.6	43.1	19.4	13.9	(72)
Region 9	23.8	20.5	26.5	29.1	(151)
Region 10	12.7	31.0	23.9	32.4	(71)
6. Directs Recruitment program					
Special preson	12.3%	22.3%	25.2%	40.2%	(301)
Regular college officer	16.4	20.6	26.6	36.5	(433)
No program	41.2	33.2	16.4	9.2	(856)

It is readily seen that again the private university ranks highest on the Recruitment Index; the two-year colleges (especially in the private sector) rank lowest. More predominantly black than white schools rank high, as do more schools with large- than with medium- or small-sized EOG programs. Since school quality is strongly related to institutional type and control, it is not surprising to find that more high quality institutions than others rank high on the Recruitment Index.

Schools with special programs utilize more recruitment channels than do those with no such programs. This is hardly surprising. It is significant, however, that utilization of different recruitment channels is higher among schools with special programs when that program is directed by someone whose sole responsibility is administering it. Many schools in an attempt to comply with federal directives to establish such programs have done so, but for lack of funds or personnel have left the direction of the program to an already overburdened financial aid director, admissions officer, or registrar. Our data suggest that greater latitude and flexibility can be achieved when separate structures are established to administer these special programs.

4. The "Effectiveness" of Recruitment

An attempt to assess the effectiveness of the recruitment activities of EOG institutions must be made with extreme caution. The study design permits no "before-after" comparison of the number of proportion of low-income/minority students. Even were such a comparison possible, it would be difficult to isolate the effect of recruitment activities from a host of other factors which may be related to increases in proportions of disadvantaged students. We can only suggest, therefore, the extent to which recruitment programs are effective by noting the correlation between relevant student characteristics and a school's position on the Recruitment Index. Further we can note the relationship between a school's reported success in achieving the stated goals of the program and the extent of its recruitment activities. In Table 4.9 several of these relationships are presented.

TABLE 4.9

SELECTED INDICATORS OF PROGRAM "SUCCESS" BY POSITION ON THE RECRUITMENT INDEX

Selected Indicators of Program Success		Recruitment Index			
		Zero	One	Two	Three
1. (a) Report increase in minority enrollment	(n)	78.3% (446)	81.5% (433)	89.5% (325)	97.5% (354)
(b) Report increase in minority enrollment largely due to EOG	(n)	11.0% (355)	13.2% (356)	15.9% (290)	22.5% (347)
2. Perceive EOG program as definitely successful	(n)	74.6% (465)	78.9% (445)	84.0% (337)	86.3% (364)
3. Report EOG program has had slight impact	(n)	40.5% (430)	37.4% (417)	24.8% (318)	20.6% (344)
4. Mean family income of EOG students	(n)	$4569 (1,595)	$4609 (2,534)	$4731 (2,262)	$5044 (2,792)
5. Percentage of EOG students who are black	(n)	14.7% (1,606)	20.3% (2,583)	29.7% (2,246)	30.5% (2,906)
6. Mean number black EOG students	(n)	20.2 (372)	35.3 (380)	45.3 (304)	57.4 (334)
7. Mean number black undergraduates	(n)	99.1 (383)	156.7 (384)	209.8 (289)	212.0 (316)
8. Percentage of all black undergraduates with EOG (6 ÷ 7)	(n)	20.4%	22.5%	21.6%	27.1%

It is readily apparent that schools which are actively engaged in recruitment activities see themselves as having a definitely successful EOG program more frequently than do the less active schools. Similarly, they not only are more likely to report increases in minority enrollment, but to aver that this increase is largely due to the availability of EOG funds. Conversely, the active recruiters are not likely to report that the EOG program has had little impact at their school aside from providing additional funds.

Although the most active recruiters report twice the proportion of black EOG recipients as the least active recruiters, mean family income of EOG recipients is highest among the most active and lowest among the least active recruiters. This is not surprising if we recall that the least active recruiters by far are the two-year schools where the highest proportion of EOG students are from the lowest income group.

Two-year schools reported that they are not engaged in active recruitment because they already have sufficient numbers of disadvantaged applicants. It was seen in Table 4.5 that (despite the lack of active recruitment) the two-year schools have an overrepresentation of financially and academically deprived students. Apparently then, the recruitment efforts of these institutions are limited because of a sufficiency of disadvantaged applicants.

This suggests that, for the present at least, the uniform emphasis on recruitment as a mandatory feature of participation in the program should be reconsidered. Schools which are not engaged in active recruitment of disadvantaged students should not be penalized when funding recommendations are made by regional or national panels. For many schools seem to have more than the number of applicants that they can handle without actively recruiting EOG archetypes. What is significant is that schools with normally low proportions of poverty/minority students are engaged in active recruitment efforts; they report increases in minority enrollments; they attribute these increases largely to the availability of EOG funds, and they perceive the program as successful.

Recruitment activities themselves, laudable as they may be, are not sufficient documentation of program "success." It is always possible that in an effort to pay lip service to program directives, schools are recruiting low-income/minority students but are engaged in what one financial aid officer called the "creaming process," that is, skimming the most academically promising students from the pool of disadvantaged students. In the following section we examine the extent to which recruitment activities are related to the admission of not only financial but academically deprived students, as well as the extent to which EOG institutions have made special provisions for the admission of students who do not meet the regular admissions criteria.

Section III. Admissions

The preceding section has pointed out that about half of the EOG schools have regular recruitment programs. However, as seen in Chapter Three, the student of exceptional financial need most often is enrolled in a non-college preparatory program in high school, is in a low quartile of his high school graduating class, has relatively low SAT-V or ACT scores. In other words, the disadvantaged student, who is the supposed target of these recruitment programs, is not always likely to be prepared to meet the usual admissions criteria of the college which does not have an open admissions policy.

EOG branch directives have increasingly warned against awarding EOG's as scholarships to students of superior academic status. Measures of ability or aptitude are not to serve as indicators of merit; in fact, participating institutions are explicitly instructed that academic potential based on the recommendation of the high school guidance counselor rather than academic achievement, class rank, or test scores, should be the criterion for admission. If colleges are adhering to these guidelines we should expect to find:

1. Schools modifying admissions requirements more frequently for EOG than for other students;
2. EOG recipients less frequently in the top quartile of their high school class than students not receiving EOG's;
3. No relationship between a student's quartile rank in high school (or his present GPA) and the size of his EOG.

The following section explores these expectations.

1. Modification of Admissions

All schools were asked to estimate the percentage of EOG students, as well as the percentage of all undergraduates for whom the usual admissions criteria are waived or modified each year. As Table 4.10 indicates, approximately one-fifth of all EOG recipients are admitted under modified criteria; this is true for only 7 per cent of all students. In other words, EOG students are almost three times as likely as all undergraduates to be unable to meet the usual admissions criteria. Table 4.10 reveals further that in every type of institution and in every area of the country EOG students are more

TABLE 4.10

MEAN PERCENT OF EOG STUDENTS AND OF ALL UNDERGRADUATES FOR WHOM THE USUAL ADMISSIONS CRITERIA ARE WAIVED OR MODIFIED BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics	Mean Percent for Whom Criteria are Waived or Modified	
	All Students	EOG Students
Total[a]	7.0% (926)	19.8% (834)
Control and type		
Private university	6.7% (45)	31.4% (42)
Public university	3.7% (66)	18.9% (54)
Private four-year	7.7% (498)	19.0% (459)
Public four-year	4.5% (152)	15.1% (39)
Private two-year	9.9% (69)	23.6% (66)
Public two-year	7.8% (496)	24.4% (74)
Racial composition		
Predominantly white	6.9% (889)	20.0% (802)
Predominantly black	10.6% (37)	16.4% (32)

---

[a] Of the 694 schools not represented in the totals, 449 have open admissions policies and 245 did not respond to the question.

TABLE 4.10--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Mean Percent for Whom Criteria are Waived or Modified	
	All Students	EOG Students
School quality		
High	6.8% (279)	26.0% (268)
Medium	6.8% (345)	17.2% (315)
Low	7.3% (253)	15.4% (208)
Federal Region		
Region 1	6.8% (98)	22.8% (79)
Region 2	7.6% (105)	29.0% (100)
Region 3	6.7% (117)	18.5% (108)
Region 4	7.9% (137)	15.5% (121)
Region 5	7.1% (178)	17.5% (162)
Region 6	7.4% (59)	14.9% (48)
Region 7	6.9% (88)	16.6% (78)
Region 8	4.2% (28)	10.9% (22)
Region 9	7.0% (76)	30.9% (66)
Region 10	5.2% (40)	13.6% (36)

TABLE 4.10--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Mean Percent for Whom Criteria are Waived or Modified	
	All Students	EOG Students
Recruitment Index		
Zero	6.2% (224)	14.3% (181)
One	6.9% (224)	13.3% (200)
Two	6.6% (204)	20.3% (183)
Three or more	8.0% (273)	28.0% (269)

likely to enter under modified admissions criteria than are other undergraduates. There are fairly substantial differences among institutional types, however, in the ratios of EOG recipients to all undergraduates admitted under special provisions. Two-year schools, for example, may waive admissions criteria for a higher percentage of EOG students than do most of the other institutional types. However, they also waive or modify criteria for all students more than do the other types of schools. The EOG student at the private university is almost five times as likely to be admitted under special provisions as is the regular applicant, while at the two-year private institution the ratio is less than two-and-one-half to one.

Similarly, in predominantly white compared to predominantly black schools, in higher compared to lower quality schools, in the North or West compared to the South, the EOG student is much more likely than other undergraduates to have entered under modified admissions criteria. Differences in the extent to which admissions criteria are waived for EOG compared to all students imply that (1) some schools are more actively recruiting academically handicapped students; or that (2) some schools have admissions criteria which are already low enough to enable academically handicapped students to enter without special provision being made for them.

Both of these factors are undoubtedly at work. As the last item in Table 4.10 reveals, the ratio of EOG to all students admitted under special provisions is lowest for the less active schools, highest for those utilizing three or more recruitment mechanisms. On the other hand, two-thirds of the public community colleges and one-third of the private two-year schools are "open admissions" institutions which admit all or almost all applicants. In these institutions, admissions criteria are "waived" for all students, EOG or otherwise.

In sum, institutions of all types and in all parts of the country appear to be awarding EOG's to students who were more likely than other students to have been admitted under special provisions. That the difference between EOG students and other undergraduates is greater in some institutional types than in others is a function of (1) the academic and socio-economic level of the student bodies at certain types of institutions, and (2) the vigorous recruitment efforts of other schools.

2. The "High Risk" Student

In the last several years a new descriptive label of the financially and academically deprived student has entered the vocabulary. Administrators talk of the "high risk" student. Although no dictionary definition exists, there is general agreement among admissions and financial aid personnel that the "high risk" student is one who can not normally meet the admissions criteria and whose high school rank and test scores are not predictive of academic success in college. EOG directives have emphasized that colleges seek out such students, admit them under special provisions, provide them with financial aid, and offer them various supportive and remedial services to enable them to correct academic deficiencies.

Financial aid officers reported that 11 per cent, or slightly over 1,000 EOG students in the FAO sample were considered "high risk" students at the time they entered college. As was seen in Table 4.5, "high risk" students are almost twice as likely to be in two-year institutions, whether public or private.

What are these "high risk" students like? Table 4.11 indicates that most have been admitted under special provisions; almost two-thirds come from the bottom half of their high school class and have low SAT or ACT scores. They have usually been in a non-college preparatory curriculum, and have a low college GPA. Over 60 per cent are receiving one or more supportive services. The lower mean family income of the "high risk" student is balanced by a higher EOG.

TABLE 4.11

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF "HIGH RISK"
AND OTHER STUDENTS

Selected Characteristics	Student Classification	
	"High Risk"	Not "High Risk"
1. Mean family income	$4399 (943)	$4841 (7,886)
2. Percentage minority students	73.7% (992)	26.4% (8,011)
3. Percentage admitted under special provisions	62.7% (1,044)	1.9% (8,352)
4. Mean SAT-Verbal	365.4 (375)	482.4 (3,618)
5. Mean ACT	15.0 (245)	24.2 (2,613)
6. In bottom half of high school class	55.2% (678)	12.2% (6,297)
7. Non-college preparatory curriculum in high school	53.9% (635)	36.8% (6,845)
8. Mean college GPA	2.01 (701)	2.54 (6,872)
9. Receives one or more supportive services	61.1% (1,056)	11.3% (8.391)
10. Mean EOG	$635 (1,052)	$553 (8,391)

If there is any single item which strongly differentiates the "high risk" from other students, it is his minority group membership. Three-fourths of all "high risk" students, compared to one-fourth of the other EOG students, stem from minority backgrounds.

The definition of "high risk" differs, however, among institutional types (Table 4.12) "High risk" students in the more selective schools have higher incomes, GPA's and test scores than those in the less selective institutions. Similarly, the definition of "high risk" varies, not only among institutional types, but also for black as compared to white students (Table 4.13).

TABLE 4.12

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF "HIGH RISK"
AND NON-"HIGH RISK" STUDENTS
BY SCHOOL QUALITY

Selected Characteristics		School Quality		
		High	Medium	Low
Mean Family Income				
High risk		$4345	$5,212	$3846
	(n)	(327)	(256)	(268)
Not high risk		$5179	$4901	$4585
	(n)	(2,037)	(2,754)	(2,394)
Mean SAT-Verbal				
High risk		391	351	325
	(n)	(175)	(109)	(72)
Not high risk		498	478	447
	(n)	(1,505)	(1,209)	(589)
Mean ACT				
High risk		14.6	14.2	15.3
	(n)	(55)	(72)	(102)
Not high risk		26.5	22.0	24.6
	(n)	(220)	(1,047)	(1,130)
Mean GPA				
High risk		2.19	2.03	1.81
	(n)	(234)	(199)	(208)
Not high risk		2.61	2.52	2.53
	(n)	(1,717)	(2,467)	(2,063)

TABLE 4.13

PERCENT OF BLACK AND WHITE STUDENTS CLASSIFIED AS "HIGH RISK" BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics	Black Students	White Students
Family Income		
Less than $3000	25.5%	7.3%
(n)	(701)	(1,252)
$3000 - $5999	27.1%	3.6%
(n)	(962)	(2,657)
$6000 or more	32.2%	2.9%
(n)	(425)	(2,044)
High School Curriculum		
College preparatory	22.1%	2.7%
(n)	(742)	(3,358)
Non-college preparatory	25.6%	5.7%
(n)	(712)	(1,769)
Mean SAT-Verbal		
Less than 300	27.3%	18.4%
(n)	(232)	(38)
300 - 499	24.1%	6.1%
(n)	(601)	(237)
500 or more	18.3%	.6%
(n)	(93)	(1,323)
Mean ACT Score		
Less than 15	30.2%	23.1%
(n)	(248)	(130)
15 - 19	18.8%	6.3%
(n)	(186)	(414)
20 or more	13.2%	1.4%
(n)	(82)	(1,376)

Not surprisingly, considering their academic and financial handicaps, black students are seven times more likely than white students to be labeled "high risk" (see Table 3.5). What is surprising, however, is that holding income or academic "achievement" constant (Table 4.13), the black student is still more likely than the white to be considered a "high risk" at the time of admission. In fact, while 32 per cent of blacks with family incomes above $6000 are "high risk" students, this is true for only 3 per cent of white students in this income category. Similarly, while 18 per cent of the blacks with SAT verbal scores above 500 are "high risk" students, less than 1 per cent of their white counterparts are classified "high risk" when admitted.

In Table 4.14 we see that the mean SAT-V or ACT scores of black "high risk" students are not much lower than those of other black students. On the other hand, white "high risk" and non-"high risk" students differ considerably on these items. In every instance the means for white "high risk" students are higher than for the black undergraduate who is not a "high risk."

These data suggest that for white students there is fairly wide consensus about what constitutes "high risk." The definition of "high risk" for black students, however, does not appear to depend upon the objective characteristics of the student. It appears, rather, to be a function of the quality of the school attended by the black student as Table 4.15 indicates.

TABLE 4.14

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF "HIGH RISK" AND NON-"HIGH RISK" STUDENTS BY RACE

Selected Characteristics	High Risk Students		Not High Risk Students	
	Black	White	Black	White
Mean SAT-Verbal	355	395	375	511
(n)	(230)	(91)	(693)	(2,499)
Mean ACT	12.9	19.0	16.0	26.2
(n)	(120)	(80)	(401)	(2,016)
Mean Family Income	$4549	$4170	$4072	$5111
(n)	(552)	(236)	(1,468)	(5,615)
Mean EOG	$659	$570	$559	$550
(n)	(610)	(260)	(1,600)	(5,861)
Mean Total Financial Aid	$1452	$1242	$1220	$1202
(n)	(332)	(188)	(1,101)	(4,852)

The data in Table 4.15 confirm that "high risk" is a relative concept for black students but not for whites. In every type of school white students who are considered "high risk" have considerably lower SAT scores, ACT scores, or mean incomes than non-"high risk" white students; there are no instances (with the exception of mean income in schools of medium quality) where the income or test scores of a white "high risk" student in one type of institution exceeds that of a white non-"high risk" student in another type of school.

Black "high risk" students are also financially and academically handicapped. However, the black "high risk" student in the high quality school appears to be less handicapped than non-"high risk" black students in medium or low quality schools. We feel that this is a significant finding. Most black students, high risk or not, are in medium or low quality schools. However, disadvantaged black students are now receiving the opportunity, through financial aid programs, to attend higher quality schools.

TABLE 4.15

MEAN INCOME, SAT-V, ACT SCORES OF BLACK AND WHITE HIGH RISK AND NON-HIGH RISK STUDENTS BY SCHOOL QUALITY

Selected Means	School Quality					
	High		Medium		Low	
	Race of Students					
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
Mean Income						
High risk	$4561	$3760	$5352	$5275	$3791	$3889
(n)	(190)	(58)	(162)	(59)	(144)	(94)
Not high risk	$4461	$5440	$4052	$5181	$3751	$4778
(n)	(366)	(1,493)	(521)	(1,930)	(413)	(1,777)
Mean SAT-Verbal						
High risk	391	407	328	391	306	383
(n)	(109)	(37)	(58)	(33)	(51)	(14)
Not high risk	398	524	376	506	344	477
(n)	(260)	(1,104)	(238)	(818)	(122)	(388)
Mean ACT						
High risk	14.4	18.3	12.8	19.7	11.9	18.1
(n)	(33)	(7)	(44)	(12)	(36)	(52)
Not high risk	19.0	31.2	16.1	23.6	14.7	26.3
(n)	(67)	(131)	(147)	(806)	(139)	(922)

This is not, in our judgement, disconsonant with EOG program goals. The data overwhelmingly attest to the concerted and successful efforts being made to award EOG's to students of exceptional financial need. They attest, too, to the success with which black high school graduates are being brought onto college campuses. It would be unrealistic, however, to expect the most severely handicapped black students to compete in high quality institutions where mean SAT's may well exceed the 600's. What admissions and financial aid personnel are obviously doing is recruiting and admitting disadvantaged black students who have at least a good chance of succeeding in such institutions. The very high retention rates in such schools (see Table 4.22) attest to the success of this policy.

The creaming process therefore gives the disadvantaged minority student an opportunity to attend other than the Open Door (some have called it the Revolving Door) low quality institution and thus to compete for the higher occupational and income status which research has shown to be related to graduation from a high quality school.

3. High School Rank

We've seen that colleges are admitting "high risk" students and that these constitute over 10 per cent of the EOG population. On the other hand, a fairly large proportion of EOG students, whether by their own report or by that of the financial aid officer, ranked in the top quartile of their high school class. In Chapter Three, in fact, it was seen that EOG freshmen recipients in our sample were as likely as ACE's national sample of freshmen to have graduated in the top quartile of their high school class (Table 3.7). This would suggest that participating institutions are engaged in the "creaming process" mentioned previously and are recruiting and admitting students of exceptional financial need but of superior academic qualification, while at the same time heeding EOG Branch directives and admitting a small percentage of "high risk" students.

We do not think that this is generally the case. We do think, and conversations with financial aid and admissions personnel confirm, that EOG recipients stem from the kinds of high schools in which ranking in the top quartile of the class is indicative only of relative academic prowess. The introduction of more objective criteria, such as ACT and SAT scores, indicates that a top quartile ranking does not necessarily go hand in hand with high test scores.

If the usual predictors of academic success in college--SAT scores, and high school rank--are not given weight when colleges recruit students of exceptional financial need, then we should expect--at least in high quality institutions--fewer EOG recipients, compared to all undergraduates, to have ranked in the top quartile of their high school class. Financial aid officers were asked what percentage of EOG students and of all undergraduates in their institution ranked in the top 25 per cent of their class in high school. As Table 4.16 indicates, there is almost no difference in the mean percentages for the two groups, EOG and all undergraduates; in fact, EOG students are slightly more likely than other students to have ranked in the top high school quartile.

TABLE 4.16

MEAN PERCENT OF EOG STUDENTS AND OF ALL UNDERGRADUATES RANKED IN TOP QUARTILE OF HIGH SCHOOL CLASS BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics		Mean Percentage in Top High School Quartile	
		EOG Students	All Undergraduates
All Schools		38.6%	35.8%
	(n)	(1,181)	(1,371)
Type and Control			
Private university		58.1%	67.4%
	(n)	(42)	(47)
Public university		49.2%	52.2%
	(n)	(83)	(91)
Private four-year		45.4%	43.4%
	(n)	(508)	(580)
Public four-year		38.7%	39.3%
	(n)	(195)	(210)
Private two-year		27.8%	20.5%
	(n)	(88)	(109)
Public two-year		22.6%	16.6%
	(n)	(265)	(334)
Racial Composition			
Predominantly white		38.9%	36.0%
	(n)	(1,133)	(1,312)
Predominantly black		32.1%	31.3%
	(n)	(48)	(59)
School Quality			
High		46.2%	54.2%
	(n)	(2,318)	(2,623)
Medium		44.1%	45.0%
	(n)	(2,960)	(3,219)
Low		36.7%	32.1%
	(n)	(2,428)	(2,635)

TABLE 4.16--Continued

Selected Characteristics		Mean Percentage in Top High School Quartile	
		EOG Students	All Undergraduates
Federal Region			
Region 1		41.6%	38.1%
	(n)	(90)	(109)
Region 2		35.0%	39.0%
	(n)	(97)	(118)
Region 3		48.0%	42.8%
	(n)	(131)	(159)
Region 4		39.6%	32.9%
	(n)	(212)	(229)
Region 5		41.9%	38.8%
	(n)	(226)	(258)
Region 6		34.7%	32.0%
	(n)	(104)	(118)
Region 7		38.2%	31.0%
	(n)	(112)	(132)
Region 8		35.0%	30.5%
	(n)	(55)	(60)
Region 9		28.2%	35.3%
	(n)	(95)	(117)
Region 10		29.2%	30.1%
	(n)	(44)	(56)
Recruitment Index			
Zero		36.2%	29.2%
	(n)	(333)	(392)
One		37.0%	32.2%
	(n)	(326)	(374)
Two		38.6%	38.1%
	(n)	(252)	(289)
Three		43.4%	46.5%
	(n)	(269)	(314)

As predicted, however, in the higher quality schools, especially the private university, the relationship is reversed and EOG students are less likely than other undergraduates to have ranked in their top high school quartile. Similarly, in Regions 2 and 9, the students who receive EOG's are less likely than other undergraduates to have ranked in the top quartile.[9]

As the last item in Table 4.16 indicates, the more actively an institution is recruiting disadvantaged students the more likely it is that fewer EOG than all undergraduates ranked in their top high school quartile.

In sum, that EOG students are even more likely than other undergraduates, with only a few exceptions, to have ranked in their top high school quartile is hardly evidence that EOG's are being awarded to the cream of the underprivileged high school crop. For our data suggest that high school quartile ranking is less a function of the objective achievement of the student than of the extent to which the "EOG type" student is competing against a college-bound high school class.

Whether the size of an EOG is determined more by financial need than by scholarship is examined in Table 4.17 which presents data on the mean dollar amount of the EOG by student's high school quartile rankings.

---

[9] In general, differences among regions are very suggestive. Regions 2 and 9 include New York and California, both of which states lead in spreading higher educational opportunities to their residents. In these two regions EOG's are awarded to students whose high school ranking is significantly lower than "all students." On the other hand, Regions 3, 4, and 8 include Southern, Border, and Mountain States which send proportionately fewer students to college. In these regions EOG's are awarded to students whose high school rank is significantly higher than "all students."

TABLE 4.17

MEAN DOLLAR AMOUNT OF EOG BY HIGH SCHOOL QUARTILE RANK BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics		High School Quartile Placement		
		Top Quartile	Second Quartile	Bottom Half
Total		$574	$561	$564
	(n)	(4,134)	(1,887)	(1,179)
Type and Control				
Private university		$695	$740	$760
	(n)	(355)	(98)	(54)
Public university		$569	$599	$600
	(n)	(1,168)	(360)	(170)
Private four-year		$651	$618	$657
	(n)	(1,316)	(590)	(392)
Public four-year		$479	$494	$523
	(n)	(1,083)	(626)	(300)
Private two year		$478	$527	$522
	(n)	(69)	(47)	(54)
Public two year		$385	$434	$383
	(n)	(143)	(166)	(209)
School Quality				
High		$624	$613	$652
	(n)	(1,269)	(466)	(318)
Medium		$582	$575	$596
	(n)	(1,502)	(665)	(335)
Low		$500	$499	$483
	(n)	(1,048)	(612)	(413)
Racial Composition				
Predominantly white		$581	$570	$570
	(n)	(3,809)	(1,725)	(1,047)
Predominantly black		$494	$464	$521
	(n)	(325)	(162)	(132)

For all students, there appears to be no relationship between academic achievement (as measured by high school quartile ranking) and the size of the EOG. Within institutional types, however, differences appear. The schools which are least likely to award larger EOG's to students of higher academic caliber are the universities, especially in the private sector, or the high quality schools (of which the universities constitute a significant proportion). Similarly, in predominantly black schools the EOG seems to be less a reward for scholarship than a recognition of financial need, given the direct relationship between family income and high school ranking.

In sum, this section has examined the extent to which schools have modified admissions criteria to admit "high risk" students and have awarded EOG's to students without assigning the usual weight to previous academic achievement. It has noted that almost all schools, but particularly the high quality-active recruiters, are admitting EOG students more frequently than other applicants under modified criteria. Similarly, these high quality-active recruiters report lower proportions of EOG than other undergraduates ranking in the top quartile of their high school classes. Since high school quartile ranking, however, is likely to be as much of a function of high school quality as of student academic achievement, it is suggested that a high proportion of EOG students who have achieved top quartile placement is not necessarily an indicator of failure to adhere to EOG guidelines.

Section IV. Retention

Recruitment and admissions form but two of the three-pronged thrust to equalize opportunity in higher education. We've seen that some colleges are making concerted efforts to seek out disadvantaged students and are not confining these efforts to the disadvantaged student who is academically superior. All types of schools in all areas of the country are waiving or modifying the normal admissions criteria and are using other than the standard measures of eligibility in order to provide the benefits of higher education to students of exceptional financial need. Seeking out students and admitting them to college is still not sufficient, however, to ensure the provision of these benefits to the disadvantaged youth of the United States.

1. Supportive Services

The lower the family income level of the student, as was seen in Chapter Three, the more likely that he ranked in the bottom half of his high school class, had an ACT or SAT-V score well below the national mean, and was enrolled in a non-college preparatory program--in sum he is relatively unprepared to pursue college level studies. Recruiting and admitting the disadvantaged student, therefore, is not sufficient--some compensatory or remedial courses must be available to bridge the academic gap between the student admitted under normal criteria and the one for whom these criteria have been modified or waived. All but 6 per cent of the schools in the sample provide one or more supportive services for students. Remedial courses are more likely to be provided by schools in the public sector, especially by the community colleges, while private universities are more likely than any other type to provide tutorial and extra counseling services (see Section II, Appendix B).

Schools were asked what percentage of EOG students generally use available supportive services, as well as the percentage of all undergraduates using such services. In those schools which are recruiting and admitting financially and academically handicapped students there should be higher proportions of EOG than of all undergraduates receiving supportive services. Table 4.18 explores this question.

In every type of school in every region of the country, a higher proportion of EOG students than of other undergraduates is likely to be using some supportive service. Table 4.18 also indicates that the percentage of all undergraduates receiving such services is inversely related to school quality. On the other hand, the ratio of EOG to all undergraduates receiving one or more supportive services is highest for the more selective schools--public and private universities in particular. Similarly, in schools with the most active recruitment programs, EOG students are two and one-half times as likely as all undergraduates to utilize remedial or tutorial services; for the least active recruiters, the ratio is approximately one and one-half to one. Apparently institutions which engage in active recruitment efforts recognize that the provision of supporting services for the disadvantaged student must accompany such efforts.

TABLE 4.18

MEAN PERCENT OF EOG AND OF ALL UNDERGRADUATES USING SUPPORTIVE SERVICES BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics	Mean Percent Using Supportive Services	
	EOG Students	All Students
All Schools	25.2%	14.2%
(n)	(1,232)*	(1,275)
Type and Control		
Private university	28.4%	9.6%
(n)	(42)	(44)
Public university	22.5%	9.5%
(n)	(87)	(88)
Private four-year	21.0%	12.2%
(n)	(483)	(506)
Public four-year	20.9%	10.7%
(n)	(189)	(190)
Private two-year	29.4%	20.4%
(n)	(100%	(103)
Public two-year	32.9%	19.1%
(n)	(331)	(344)
School Quality		
High	27.3%	11.1%
(n)	(290)	(299)
Medium	21.7%	12.4%
(n)	(348)	(366)
Low	26.4%	17.1%
(n)	(531)	(548)
Racial Composition		
Predominantly white	24.9%	13.6%
(n)	(1,172)	(1,217)
Predominantly black	30.5%	27.9%
(n)	(60)	(58)

---

*(n) = number of institutions.

TABLE 4.18--Continued

Selected Characteristics		Mean Percent Using Supportive Services	
		EOG Students	All Students
Federal Region			
Region 1		24.6%	13.2%
	(n)	(87)	(92)
Region 2		29.9%	13.1%
	(n)	(118)	(120)
Region 3		20.8%	13.4%
	(n)	(141)	(144)
Region 4		24.8%	16.8%
	(n)	(208)	(221)
Region 5		22.6%	11.7%
	(n)	(213)	(224)
Region 6		24.8%	16.0%
	(n)	(99)	(103)
Region 7		20.3%	12.8%
	(n)	(118)	(124)
Region 8		18.8%	14.9%
	(n)	(54)	(53)
Region 9		38.1%	17.0%
	(n)	(128)	(127)
Region 10		24.4%	12.8%
	(n)	(55)	(56)
Recruitment Index			
Zero		23.2%	14.6%
	(n)	(320)	(348)
One		22.6%	15.4%
	(n)	(337)	(347)
Two		27.4%	15.3%
	(n)	(348)	(366)
Three or more		28.2%	11.5%
	(n)	(531)	(548)

Who receives these supportive services? As Table 4.19 indicates, disadvantaged students who were in the bottom quartile of their high school class are more than three times as likely to use one or more of the supportive services as those in the top quartile. It was seen (Table 4.11) that 60 per cent of the "high risk" students receive remedial or tutorial help. These services are most likely to be utilized by "high risk" students, however, at the private university where 71 per cent use supportive services.

TABLE 4.19

PERCENT OF EOG STUDENTS USING SUPPORTIVE SERVICE BY SELECTED STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Student's High School Quartile Rank		
Top	10.0%	(4,149)
Second	19.9	(1,899)
Bottom half	32.6	(1,191)
"High Risk" Students in:		
Private university	70.6	(51)
Public university	53.1	(224)
Private four-year	65.8	(272)
Public four-year	60.5	(324)
Private two-year	60.0	(40)
Public two-year	63.0	(135)

2. Residence Facilities

The provision of supportive services is only one means of seeking to reduce the academic handicaps of disadvantaged students. Many financial aid officers have expressed the belief that the disadvantaged student can best overcome his academic handicaps if he is removed from the poverty of his home environment and brought to the campus as a resident student. That this belief is widely shared is suggested in Table 4.20.

TABLE 4.20

MEAN PERCENT OF EOG STUDENTS AND OF ALL UNDERGRADUATES LIVING ON CAMPUS BY SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Institutional Characteristics		Mean Percent Living on Campus	
		EOG Students	All Students
Total		68.2%	56.8%
	(n)	(1,124)	(1,158)
Type and control			
Private university		64.8%	52.5%
	(n)	(42)	(47)
Public university		60.0%	42.4%
	(n)	(89)	(89)
Private four-year		72.5%	66.1%
	(n)	(577)	(597)
Public four-year		64.9%	46.3%
	(n)	(217)	(218)
Private two-year		70.1%	60.6%
	(n)	(101)	(106)
Public two-year		58.0%	35.1%
	(n)	(98)	(101)

TABLE 4.20--Continued

Selected Institutional Characteristics		Mean Percent Living on Campus	
		EOG Students	All Students
Racial Composition			
Predominantly white		68.1%	56.6%
	(n)	(1,068)	(1,101)
Predominantly black		70.3%	59.9%
	(n)	(56)	(57)
School Quality			
High		70.4%	61.6%
	(n)	(312)	(332)
Medium		68.5%	59.0%
	(n)	(404)	(421)
Low		65.6%	50.4%
	(n)	(372)	(388)
Recruitment Index			
Zero		70.2%	58.2%
	(n)	(302)	(306)
One		66.5%	55.6%
	(n)	(308)	(321)
Two		68.3%	58.2%
	(n)	(247)	(250)
Three or more		68.0%	55.4%
	(n)	(267)	(281)

In every type of institution there is a higher proportion of EOG than of other undergraduates living on campus. We have no evidence, other than the testimony of financial aid officers that concerted efforts are being made to provide sufficient financial aid for disadvantaged students to live on campus. Certainly, the most disadvantaged of the EOG students do not live on campus. For example, only 61 per cent of the students with under $3000 income but 70 per cent of those over $9000 live on campus. Similarly, 59 per cent of the "high risk" students compared to 68 per cent of non-"high risk" undergraduates are resident students. It does not seem, therefore, that efforts are necessarily being made to bring the most disadvantaged students in as resident students.

However, that more EOG than other undergraduates do live on campus, raises another question. Does living on campus, rather than commuting, enhance the probability of academic survival for the disadvantaged student?

TABLE 4.21

CUMULATIVE GPA OF BLACK AND WHITE EOG STUDENTS BY RESIDENCE AND BY HIGH SCHOOL QUARTILE PLACEMENT

High School Quartile Placement		Black Students		White Students	
		Resident	Commuter	Resident	Commuter
Top quartile		2.38	2.40	2.76	2.85
	(n)	(426)	(141)	(1,808)	(669)
Second quartile		2.19	2.04	2.33	2.41
	(n)	(219)	(92)	(723)	(319)
Bottom half		2.02	1.96	2.16	2.23
	(n0	(160)	(88)	(267)	(213)

Residence, as Table 4.21 indicates, appears to have little or no effect on the GPA of either white or black students. That is, black students who ranked in the bottom half of their high school class have lower GPA's than other black students, whether or not they live on campus. The same is true for white students. The data do suggest, however, that holding high school quartile placement constant, living on campus has a very slight depressing effect on GPA for whites, a very slight elevating one for blacks.[10]

It is far from clear then that living on campus is an integral ingredient in overcoming the academic handicaps of disadvantaged students. Far more information, however, than that gathered in the course of this investigation would be required to unravel more fully the role of residency on campus in overcoming the handicaps with which disadvantaged students enter college.

3. Retention and Attrition Rates

Most institutions appear to be making Herculean efforts, in spite of insufficient funds,[11] to provide the supportive services required by disadvantaged students. Financial aid officers were asked to report the percentages of 1968 freshmen (EOG and other freshmen) who had reenrolled in Fall 1969. Fiscal-Operations Reports contain data on numbers of EOG students dropping out of school for financial, academic, or other reasons. These data are presented in this final section of Chapter Four.

---

[10] These differences are too slight to be considered seriously. However, it is interesting that black resident students perceive themselves as doing above average work more frequently than do black nonresidents.

[11] Almost half of the institutions reported that their efforts to recruit disadvantaged students were limited by the inadequacy of funds for the supportive services that such students would require, once admitted.

Table 4.22 compares 1968-69 freshmen retention rates for EOG and for all undergraduates in different kinds of institutions. The highest retention rates for both groups are in private universities; the lowest in public two-year institutions. Retention rates are almost identical for predominantly black and white institutions, but are highest in the most selective and lowest in the least selective schools. Since higher quality institutions are overrepresented in Regions 1, 2, 3, and 5, the higher retention rates in these regions are not unexpected.

TABLE 4.22

MEAN PERCENT OF 1968-69 FRESHMEN EOG RECIPIENTS AND ALL 1968-69 FRESHMEN WHO REENROLLED IN 1969-70 BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics		Mean Percent 1968-69 Freshmen Who Reenrolled	
		EOG Students	All Students
All Schools		67.4%	70.2%
	(n)	(1,362)	(1,465)
Type and Control			
Private university		79.7%	86.2%
	(n)	(50)	(50)
Public university		69.9%	73.1%
	(n)	(101)	(93)
Private four-year		73.5%	76.0%
	(n)	(606)	(625)
Public four-year		70.3%	71.2%
	(n)	(243)	(228)
Private two-year		61.6%	66.6%
	(n)	(97)	(119)
Public two-year		49.4%	57.3%
	(n)	(265)	(350)

TABLE 4.22--CONTINUED

S Selected Characteristics		Mean Percent 1968-69 Freshmen Who Reenrolled	
		EOG Students	All Students
Racial Composition			
Predominantly white		67.3%	70.2%
	(n)	(1,297)	(1,403)
Predominantly black		69.3%	69.5%
	(n)	(65)	(62)
School Quality			
High		75.5%	78.2%
	(n)	(348)	(370)
Medium		71.0%	73.5%
	(n)	(446)	(461)
Low		58.6%	62.8%
	(n)	(517)	(621)
Federal Region			
Region 1		71.3%	75.2%
	(n)	(108)	(114)
Region 2		74.9%	77.7%
	(n)	(116)	(127)
Region 3		75.5%	76.4%
	(n)	(158)	(165)
Region 4		67.4%	70.0%
	(n)	(231)	(253)
Region 5		69.6%	72.1%
	(n)	(244)	(261)
Region 6		60.3%	63.0%
	(n)	(129)	(131)
Region 7		64.1%	68.5%
	(n)	(130)	(135)
Region 8		63.8%	67.0%
	(n)	(58)	(66)

TABLE 4.22--Continued

Selected Characteristics		Mean Percent 1968-69 Freshmen Who Reenrolled	
		EOG Students	All Students
Region 9		62.3%	62.4%
	(n)	(105)	(128)
Region 10		53.1%	58.7%
	(n)	(65)	(66)
Percent for Whom Admissions Criteria are Modified			
1 - 9%		70.9%	75.1%
	(n)	(320)	(619)
10 - 19%		69.4%	72.0%
	(n)	(229)	(171)
20 - 99%		72.1%	68.2%
	(n)	(275)	(68)
Open Admissions		61.4%	64.3%
	(n)	(418)	(399)
Percent Using Supportive Services			
0 - 4		69.2%	74.3%
	(n)	(224)	(266)
5 - 9		68.3%	70.5%
	(n)	(140)	(256)
10 - 14		68.4%	69.2%
	(n)	(178)	(273)
15-- 19		65.0%	66.1%
	(n)	(62)	(105)
20% or more		65.2%	65.0%
	(n)	(499)	(312)

Reenrollment rates are, not unexpectedly, related to the extent to which admissions criteria are waived or modified for all or for EOG students. The lowest retention rates for both EOG and other undergraduates obtain in Open Admissions institutions. Retention rates for regular undergraduates vary inversely with the rate at which admissions criteria are modified or waived for them. For EOG students, however, only in Open Admissions institutions is the retention rate low. Otherwise, there is no relationship between retention of EOG students and the extent to which admissions criteria are waived. In other words, the retention rates for EOG students are about the same whether admissions criteria are modified for small or large percentages of students. This suggests that admitting fairly large proportions of disadvantaged students who fail to meet the regular admissions criteria does not necessarily predict a high attrition rate for these students. It may be that placed in a college context where a large majority of (but not all) students are successfully pursuing their studies, EOG students, with remedial assistance, are themselves buoyed to strive for academic success. In the Open Admissions institution, where many students are academically handicapped, the college context may not be conducive to the success of the EOG (or the regular undergraduate) student. Furthermore, the vast financial, administrative, political problems of the Open Admissions institution may make it difficult to give the EOG student the personalized guidance and supportive services necessary to overcome the academic handicaps under which he enters.[12]

---

[12] In a recent article on "Open Admissions" at CUNY, in The New York Times, the authors noted that retention rates for SEEK students

Similarly, the higher the percentage of students receiving supportive services in an institution, the lower the retention rate. At first glance it appears that the more a school tries to provide opportunities for disadvantaged students to overcome academic handicaps, the less successful are they in the end. However, the last section of Table 4.19 could be interpreted as follows: When schools provide only limited supportive services, EOG students have lower retention rates than do all undergraduates. When schools provide supportive services to larger proportions of students, there is no difference in retention rates between EOG and all undergraduates. Of course, this may be an artifact of the high proportions receiving supportive services in two-year institutions (where EOG and all undergraduates are similarly handicapped). It may be, however, that intensive remedial support being given EOG students is helping to narrow the gap between them and all students.

While there is wide variation in retention rates among different institutional types, there is little difference in the reenrollment rates of EOG freshmen and other freshmen. The retention rate for EOG freshmen is slightly lower, within each institutional type, than that for all freshmen but the differences are surprisingly small. Apparently, although EOG students enter with academic and financial

---

were high because of the one-to-one guidance counseling, and tutoring which these students received. In contrast, they warned, the masses of students who entered the various branches in CUNY in Fall 1970 are receiving inadequate and inconsistent remedial assistance and are likely to be victims of attrition in large numbers. Resnik, S. and Kaplan, B., "Report Card on Open Admissions: Remedial Work Recommended," The New York Times Magazine, May 9, 1971.

handicaps, by the end of the first year they have either overcome or reduced these handicaps sufficiently to enable them to remain in school at almost the same rate as other students.

For the 1968-69 Fiscal-Operations Reports, aid officers were asked to report the numbers of students terminating their studies due to graduation, or for financial, academic, or other reasons. After eliminating those who terminated their studies due to graduation, we find 16,466 leaving for financial, academic, or other reasons (Table 4-23). Attrition due to financial factors, 11 per cent for all EOG recipients, is higher in the private than the public sector, substantially higher in predominantly black than white institutions, and lower in Regions 2, 7, and 8 than in the other Federal Regions. The 22 per cent attrition rate due to financial factors at predominantly black institutions attests to the desperate need for additional funding for these schools which are struggling to meet the monetary requirements of exceptionally low-income student bodies.

Attrition rates for academic reasons, 32 per cent for all 1968-69 EOG recipients, vary widely by institutional type and control, racial composition, and Federal Region. The more rigorous curriculum at the private university goes hand in hand with an attrition rate of 38 per cent. Similarly, the predominance of more selective institutions on the East Coast probably accounts for the high attrition rates for academic reasons in Regions 1, 2, and 3. Perhaps the exceptionally poor high school preparation of the Southern black student accounts for the 42 per cent rate of attrition for academic reasons at predominantly black institutions.

TABLE 4.23

PERCENTAGE OF ALL 1968-69 EOG STUDENTS WHO TERMINATED THEIR STUDIES FOR FINANCIAL OR ACADEMIC REASONS BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS**

(Fiscal-Operations Data)

Selected Characteristics	Percentage Ending Studies For Financial Reasons	Percentage Ending Studies For Academic Reasons	Number of Students
Total	7.3%	31.7%	(24,108)*
Type of Control			
Private university	7.7%	38.4%	(1,149)
Public university	4.7	35.2	(5,626)
Private four-year	9.7	31.2	(6,421)
Public four-year	8.2	30.7	(6,089)
Private two-year	10.3	26.4	(997)
Public two-year	5.0	28.1	(3,826)
Racial Composition			
Predominantly white	6.8%	30.8%	(22,148)
Predominantly black	13.1	41.6	(1,960)
Federal Region			
Region 1	7.0%	40.5%	(1,063)
Region 2	5.7	39.9	(2,309)
Region 3	8.0	37.6	(1,842)
Region 4	8.0	33.3	(3,817)
Region 5	7.6	29.0	(5,336)
Region 6	7.2	29.7	(3,457)
Region 7	4.8	31.4	(2,288)
Region 8	6.7	21.0	(1,067)
Region 9	10.6	25.9	(1,820)
Region 10	7.4	27.5	(941)

*The difference between the sum of the two percentages and 100 per cent represents the rate of attrition for reasons other than financial or academic factors, e.g., 61.0 per cent for all students, 60.1 per cent at the public university level, etc.

**n = number of students who terminated studies for any reason.

It is encouraging that "only" 3 per cent of the 254,000 students receiving EOG's in 1968-69 were victims of attrition for academic reasons. However, that 3 per cent, it should be noted, represents 8,000 young people who were exposed to college, may have had visions of climbing the occupational ladder through the educational process, and then "failed to make the grade." This should give cause for concern.[13]

Our data indicate that EOG students have relatively high expectations. Virtually all of them plan to complete at least four years of schooling. It is unlikely that the goals or expectations of EOG students who failed to reenroll were substantially different from the goals and expectations of our sample. Inability to continue, therefore, may well have resulted in anger, disappointment, and frustration caused by the dashing of raised expectations.

It is imperative therefore that built into the allocation to each institution and to each student be sufficient funds to ensure both his financial and academic survival in college. Adequate financial aid without adequate provision for reducing academic handicaps will still result in high attrition rates and feelings of personal failure.[14]

---

[13] Our data do not permit us to establish who were these victims of attrition. Were they "high risk" students? Had they received remedial assistance? Why did they fail to reenroll? What are they doing at present? Have they been helped to find employment? Only a follow-up study can begin to provide answers to these kinds of questions. It should also be noted that this 3 per cent attrition rate is for EOG recipients only. We have no way of knowing how this rate compared for all undergraduates at these institutions.

[14] Burton Clark notes that if the chance to achieve (through the educational process) is considered somewhat available, then non-achieving is seen as a personal failure rather than as the fault of the society. See Clark, B. C., Educating the Expert Society, Chandler Publishing Company, California, 1962, p. 74.

It should be noted, furthermore, that the differential retention rates revealed in Table 4.22 have important policy implications. The size of an EOG allocation is determined in part by retention expectations. Institutions whose request for renewal funds is computed on a retention estimate exceeding 60 per cent (two-year) or 65 per cent (four-year) are subject to review. Although an upward adjustment is usually made by a review panel, the school which is most "successful" in achieving a high retention rate is also most likely to be penalized by an inadequate renewal allocation. Transfer from initial year funds may enable grants to be made to all reenrolling students but this leaves a deficit for initial year funding commitments which must somehow be met from institutional funds.

At the other end of the spectrum is the public two-year institution with its high attrition rates. The problem of meeting renewal commitments is not severe. Nor is this problem compounded, as it is at the four-year or university level, by possibly high transfer rates to the school. The problem is first one of providing initial year grants to the large numbers of entrants requiring financial aid. But even if all financial needs of entering freshmen could be met,[15] there still remains the problem of overcoming academic deficiencies and reducing attrition rates. In a sense, as one administrator wryly put it, "the more successful we are (in enrolling large numbers of disadvantaged students) the more we are doomed to failure (through high attrition rates)."

---

[15] In the next chapter we discuss the financial aid policies and practices of institutions and note that two-year schools report that they frequently have to stretch their allocation by awarding smaller grants to larger numbers of students.

One answer of course lies in increased funding--funding sufficiently generous to enable an almost one-to-one remedial, tutorial, counseling relationship with handicapped students. Many schools use Work-Study students for this purpose but CWS students are often in need of supportive services themselves, especially at the two-year institution. Such programs as Special Services for Disadvantaged Students have only begun to fill the tremendous needs of these institutions.

Increasing funding, however, is not the only answer. Other recommendations which are suggested by our data will be presented at the end of the next chapter after an examination of institutional policies and practices in the packaging of financial aid for students.

Recruitment, modification of admissions, provision of supportive services are all activities which are specified as conditions for institutional participation in the EOG program. They are integral parts of the effort to bring the benefits of higher education to disadvantaged high school graduates. The core of the EOG program, however, lies in the provision of financial aid to needy students. We turn in the next chapter, therefore, to an examination of institutional policies and practices governing the distribution of EOG funds for students.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINANCIAL AID:
POLICIES, PRACTICES, PACKAGING

Chapter Four described the institutions participating in the EOG program. The data indicate that many schools have established special programs for the recruitment of disadvantaged students. Almost all of these schools (97 per cent) report that EOG funds are used to provide financial aid to students recruited under these special programs. An EOG, however, must be matched with other sources of aid and the success of a financial aid program is partially a function of the skill with which a financial aid "package" is developed to meet the special requirements of students in different kinds of institutions and with differing degrees of need. This chapter, therefore, will describe and analyze the financial aid packages of EOG recipients, and the packaging policies of institutions participating in the EOG program. The data to be presented are drawn from the student and institutional questionnaires as well as from the Fiscal-Operations Reports submitted by the schools in August 1969 to U.S. Office of Education.

Section I. Financial Aid Policy and Practice

Do institutions have established practices regarding the packaging of financial aid for an EOG recipient? Are students generally required to work at a term-time job? To take out a loan? Table 5.1

presents data on financial aid policies and practices for all responding schools, by predominant racial composition and by type and control. A quick glance at the data reveals wide variation in policy and practice among types of institutions.

For example, 35 per cent of the predominantly white but only 20 per cent of the predominantly black schools indicate that their 1969-70 allocation was sufficient to award initial year grants to every eligible student.[1] Similarly the four-year public school is more likely to report inadequate funds than are the other types of institutions. A major correlate of the adequacy of the EOG funds is the proportion of all full-time undergraduates receiving any form of financial aid. In schools where less than 25 per cent of the student body receive financial aid, 42 per cent report that their allocation was adequate; in those institutions where 60 per cent or more of the students receive financial aid, only 26 per cent assert that the EOG allocation was sufficient to cover all applicants.

The key explanation, however, for inadequacy of funds is a very simple one. Every school submits an application for funds for the following fiscal year. These applications are reviewed by regional panels (of financial aid officers) and specified sums are approved for each institution. When the time for allocating the monies arrives, however, the Congressional appropriation is not sufficient to cover the panel recommendations and the institutions in each state, therefore, receive a specified

---

[1] This is not surprising in light of the fact that in predominantly black colleges, 67% of the student body receive financial aid.

TABLE 5.1

FINANCIAL AID POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE EOG PROGRAM BY TYPE AND CONTROL, AND BY RACIAL COMPOSITION OF STUDENT BODY

Selected Characteristics	All Schools	Predominantly White	Predominantly Black	Private University	Public University	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
1. EOG allocation was insufficient to cover applicants	65.8% (1,600)	65.1% (1,529)	80.3% (71)	66.7% (51)	66.7% (117)	63.3% (659)	72.9% (258)	66.1% (121)	65.0% (394)
2. If not sufficient, preference was given to:									
a. Freshmen	78.2% (1,055)	77.5% (997)	89.7% (58)	100.0% (34)	87.2% (78)	79.4% (418)	85.6% (188)	68.4% (79)	68.2% (258)
b. Local (in-state) residents	15.1% (1,052)	14.4% (994)	27.6% (58)	- (34)	24.4% (78)	5.8% (416)	18.7% (187)	8.9% (79)	28.7% (258)
c. Upperclassmen:	32.7% (1,055)	32.4% (997)	38.9% (58)	11.8% (34)	19.2% (78)	33.7% (418)	25.0% (188)	45.6% (79)	39.5% (258)
d. Students with better academic performance	22.0% (1,054)	20.8% (996)	43.1% (58)	11.8% (34)	16.7% (78)	24.9% (417)	23.4% (188)	17.7% (79)	20.5% (258)
e. Students of minority group background	63.7% (1,053)	63.8% (995)	62.1% (58)	70.6% (34)	65.4% (78)	68.0% (416)	61.0% (187)	61.3% (80)	58.1% (258)

TABLE 5.1--Continued

Selected Characteristics	All Schools	Predominantly White	Predominantly Black	Private University	Public University	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
3. Students generally not awarded EOG's:	(1,620)	(1,548)	(72)	(53)	(117)	(667)	(262)	(123)	(398)
a. Transfer students	14.9%	14.6%	20.8%	17.0%	12.8%	16.9%	10.7%	17.9%	13.6%
b. Married students	35.7	36.0	27.8	30.2	53.8	38.4	42.7	26.0	24.9
c. Students with poor academic performance	13.6	13.1	25.0	7.5	6.0	14.8	16.4	14.6	12.6
d. Evening students	36.7	36.9	31.9	43.4	41.0	34.8	43.1	35.0	33.9
4. Would prefer to allocate:	(1,605)	(1,535)	(70)	(52)	(116)	(658)	(261)	(121)	(397)
a. Smaller amounts to more students	36.6%	36.5%	40.0%	17.3%	31.0%	33.4%	37.9%	37.2%	45.1%
b. Larger amounts to fewer students	10.5	10.4	11.4	23.1	6.9	14.6	4.6	14.8	5.8
5. Awards often limited to stretch allocation	28.5 (1,603)	27.8 (1,534)	43.5 (69)	9.6 (52)	20.0 (115)	22.2 (662)	31.3 (259)	34.2 (120)	40.5 (395)
6. Mean percentage receiving aid	38.4% (1,576)	37.1% (1,508)	66.6% (68)	46.2% (51)	31.3% (113)	47.1% (654)	38.9% (256)	40.0% (120)	23.5% (382)

TABLE 5.1--Continued

Selected Characteristics	All Schools	Predominantly White	Predominantly Black	Private University	Public University	Private Four-Year	Public Four-Year	Private Two-Year	Public Two-Year
7. Mean EOG	$562 (10,066)	$570 (9,095)	$492 (970)	$703 (626)	$573 (2,504)	$638 (2,910)	$494 (2,969)	$518 (234)	$414 (822)
8. Mean total financial aid	$1230 (9,363)	$1251 (8,474)	$1036 (889)	$1781 (542)	$1195 (2,246)	$1439 (2,884)	$1024 (2,635)	$1115 (234)	$924 (822)
9. Percent EOG of total financial aid (7÷8)	45.7%	45.6%	47.5%	39.5%	47.9%	44.3%	48.2%	46.4%	44.8%
10. School has established packaging practices	81.0 (1,598)	80.5 (1,528)	92.9 (70)	75.5 (53)	87.8 (115)	77.4 (656)	86.2 (260)	83.2 (119)	81.8 (395)
11. Students generally required to take loan	49.3% (1,513)	49.5% (1,445)	45.6% (68)	57.7% (52)	51.8% (114)	53.1% (639)	54.0% (250)	40.7% (113)	39.7% (345)
12. Student generally required to work during term	52.0% (1,518)	51.7% (1,449)	58.0% (69)	30.0% (50)	35.8% (109)	48.1% (628)	43.6% (243)	61.2% (116)	68.8% (372)
13. Total 1969-70 allocation was inadequate	57.2% (1,601)	56.5% (1,530)	71.8% (71)	57.7% (52)	55.8% (113)	53.3% (661)	66.8% (259)	60.3% (116)	57.0% (395)

percentage of the amount which has been approved. We divided the fifty states into five categories, according to the percentage of the panel approved request that institutions in the state actually received. In Table 5.2 it can be seen that this variable explains much of the variation in reports as to the adequacy of the EOG allocation.

TABLE 5.2

SUFFICIENCY OF EOG ALLOCATION BY PERCENTAGE OF PANEL APPROVED AMOUNT STATE ACTUALLY RECEIVED

Percentage State (Institutions) Actually Received	Allocation Sufficient	(n)
85% or more	55.6%	(322)
80-84	32.0	(231)
75-99	33.0	(415)
70-74	28.1	(302)
Less than 70%	21.8	(330)

In states which were funded at 85 per cent or higher, 56 per cent of the institutions reported sufficient funds; in states, however, which were funded at less than 70 per cent, only 22 per cent reported their allocation to be sufficient. Unfortunately, to compound the problem, the schools which most desperately require additional monies are the least favored. One-third of the predominantly black institutions, compared to 21 per cent of the white ones, are funded at less than 70 per cent. In the 330 institutions in states funded at this low rate, the mean percentage receiving financial aid is 42 per cent. In the 322 schools in states funded at 85 per cent or better, the percentage receiving financial aid is less--37 per cent.

These findings underscore the extreme importance of appropriating sufficient monies to cover panel approved requests for funds. A formula which has been calculated to correct inequitable distribution of funds is obviously not achieving this objective. Rather monies are being disproportionately channeled to the detriment of those with the greatest need.

Differences in the adequacy of the allocation are accompanied by variations in policies as to whom to give preference (or whom to deny a grant) when the allocation is insufficient to cover all eligible students. The predominantly black school more frequently reports giving priority to freshmen, to in-state residents, and to students with higher academic performance. Conversely, they are less likely when the money is tight, than predominantly white institutions, to award EOG's to transfer students or to students with poor academic performance.

As might be expected, the public institutions, especially the community colleges give priority to in-state residents when awarding EOG's. More than three-fourths of all schools favor freshmen, if money is tight, but this is particularly true at the university level.

Despite the program directive to not award EOG's on the basis of academic performance, it appears that when the allocation is insufficient to cover all eligible applicants, preference is given to the better student. This is particularly true for the two-year institutions, more than two-fifths of whom give priority to students with better academic performance. At the university level, on the other hand, financial aid personnel are least likely to use academic criteria in withholding EOG's.

These differences in the degree to which academic performance enters into the allocation of scarce resources may stem from several factors. First, they may be largely due to differences of demand. Two-year schools are flooded with applications (for admission and for financial aid) from students of both lower academic rank and lower socio-economic status. In Chapter Four it was seen that the poor student, both academically and financially, is much more likely to find his way to the community college than to the university. In fact, when asked what factors tend to limit recruitment efforts, 46 per cent of the public and 39 per cent of the private two-year schools report that they have more than enough eligible applicants. Only 13 per cent of the private and 22 per cent of the public universities report that recruitment efforts are limited by this factor. Accordingly, it is not surprising that the two-year schools, as well as the predominantly black institutions, inundated with eligible applicants, must establish priorities in the awarding of limited EOG monies.

Another factor which may account for the differences in the extent to which academic criteria enter into the allocation of EOG's within an institution is probably the differential availability of alternative sources of student financial aid. Applicants to both private and public universities, with relatively higher test scores and high school grades, are more likely to have state or other scholarships. (See Table A5.6, Appendix A.) Similarly, the university itself, tends to have more alternative sources from which to obtain scholarship funds and can therefore reserve its EOG allocation for the needy applicant without regard to academic performance. In fact, 74 per cent of the private universities report that as part of their program to recruit disadvantaged students they set aside institutional funds for these students; only 30 per cent of two-year schools (both public and private) report this practice.[2]

The insufficiency of EOG funds appears then to have differential implications at different kinds of institutions. The universities can turn to institutional or state money and can concentrate EOG funds on the most financially needy applicants. The two-year schools, however, with more eligible applicants than can be accommodated by their EOG allocation are forced to establish priorities. One such priority is superior academic performance. A second is a "first come, first served" basis of determining the distribution of awards.[3]

Both of these priorities--better academic performance and earlier application for aid[4]--have implications for the stated goals of the EOG program, since they penalize the student of lower socioeconomic status, as well as the minority student. In Chapter Three it was found that low income and minority students rank lower in the high school class, have lower SAT and ACT scores, decide later to attend college, and more frequently find out that they are eligible for financial aid only after completing high school or entering college. If the goal of the program is to ensure that EOG funds are targeted to students of exceptional financial need, without regard for academic criteria, then it becomes necessary to allocate sufficient funds to meet the needs of institutions with particularly high proportions of eligible students. Otherwise, it is only natural that schools establish priorities in the allocation of scarce resources with the indirect result of penalizing the most disadvantaged students.

---

[2] Public institutions do not have the same control over the distribution of funds received from the state or locality. It is not surprising therefore that they less frequently set aside institutional funds. (See Table 4.6, Chapter Four.)

[3] This response option was not included in the questionnaire; it was presented, however, by many respondents as an "other" priority in the allocation of grants.

[4] The two are related since the student with better grades and test scores is also more likely to be an earlier applicant.

Finally it should be noted that one out of seven schools generally withholds EOG's from transfer students. As our conversations with financial aid personnel confirm, this does not stem from malice but rather from commitments to the students already enrolled. It is of more than academic interest, however, since this restriction occurs at the four-year institution--the next step in the academic progress of many EOG students from the community colleges. Several financial aid officers mentioned that insufficient account is taken, in the allocation formulas, of increasing transfer rates. That the transfer student is penalized is evidenced by the fact that such students comprise only 6 per cent of the student population at institutions which generally do not award EOG's to transfers, compared to 12 per cent at other schools.

The majority of schools report that their 1969-70 allocation was inadequate. This is especially true of four-year public institutions (11 per cent of which are predominantly black schools). Surprisingly, only 28 per cent of the schools report that they frequently stretch their allocation in order to give EOG's to more students, although 37 per cent would prefer to see smaller grants going to greater numbers of students. As might be expected, the public institutions, particularly two-year community colleges, most frequently opt for giving less money to more students; the private university, on the other hand, with its higher tuition and fees, would prefer to award larger sums of money to fewer students. Accordingly 40 per cent of the public two-year schools, compared to only 10 per cent of the private universities, actually do stretch their allocation in order to give grants to more students.

Increasingly, private institutions have been expressing concern about the weakness of their position vis-a-vis the public sector. Here can be seen an example of their predicament. The public institution with low costs is able to reduce the size of grants and stretch an allocation to cover more students. In the private sector this is more difficult. High costs mean not only larger EOG's but also larger amounts of matching funds which must somehow be raised through institutional efforts.

These wide variations in reported preferences as to the size of an EOG award are reflected in the mean size of the EOG's in different types of schools. As item 7 in Table 5.1 indicates, the mean size of an EOG award in a private university (which seldom stretches its allocation to cover more students) is $703--almost $300 more than in public two-year institutions. Similarly, that the mean EOG in predominantly black schools is $492, compared to $570 in predominantly white institutions, may also be related to the former's practice of stretching their allocation to cover more students. (See items 5 and 8 in Table 5.1.) That predominantly black schools frequently stretch their allocation to provide EOG's for more students is not surprising in light of the fact that the mean percentage of students receiving financial aid in these schools is 66 per cent (compared to 37 per cent of students in predominantly white schools). These schools, with predominantly black student bodies are obviously struggling to meet the needs of the large proportions of students requiring financial aid.

The serious plight of the predominantly black college was recently noted in a Carnegie Commission report which stressed the need for a "dramatic increase" in financial support, especially at the federal level. The Commission proposed a tripling of federal support in the form of institutional grants, construction loans, and direct student grants and loans.[5] In Appendix A we present data which further attest to the unique financial difficulties faced by predominantly black colleges.

The extent to which individual grants are reduced in order to cover more students is a function of several factors. As Table 5.3 indicates, the limitation of the size of awards is more frequent in schools where tuition and room-and-board fees are lower. In fact, more than 30 per cent of the schools which often limit awards, compared to only one-fifth of those which never do, have no on-campus residence facilities. Surprisingly, neither the proportion of all undergraduates receiving financial aid, nor the proportion that EOG students constitute of the entire student body, is related to the frequency of stretching allocations.

---

[5] The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. V, No. 20, February 2, 1971.

The relativity of the word "larger" (number of students over whom an allocation is stretched) may be seen by the fact that the practice is more common in the small- than in the large-program school. In other words, the small-program school stretches its EOG allocation to cover an average of 40 students; the large-program school awards an average of 400 EOG's without limiting the size of individual awards.

Interestingly, the policy of limiting the size of an EOG in order to cover more students is unrelated to the student's report of the adequacy of his financial aid. Those receiving less financial aid and smaller EOG's report their additional requirements as somewhat less than students who receive larger financial aid packages. In other words the practice of limiting the size of EOG's in order to stretch the total allocation over a larger number of students is not necessarily detrimental to the students' requirements. It merely underscores the need for permitting flexibility at the institutional level so that financial aid personnel can distribute their allocation with maximum effectiveness. In our conversations with financial aid officers, they express concern that the new application form which requires the documenting of future needs with increasing precision will detract from their freedom to exercise flexibility in the distribution of EOG's.

TABLE 5.3

SELECTED CORRELATES OF INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICE OF LIMITING SIZE OF EOG'S TO COVER MORE STUDENTS

Item		School Limits Size of EOG's		
		Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Mean tuition and fees		$ 712 (444)	$ 968 (701)	$1075 (427)
2. Mean room and board		$ 863 (307)	$ 927 (565)	$ 955 (342)
3. Mean percentage receiving financial aid		37.1% (444)	39.1% (699)	38.5% (418)
4. Percentage that EOG students constitute of total enrollment		(452)	(705)	(426)
Less than 3%		31.9%	40.7	27.4
11% or more		29.1	47.9	23.0
5. Size of EOG program				
Small	(1,004)	30.9%	45.1%	24.0%
Medium	(405)	24.7%	44.4%	30.9%
Large	(194)	24.2%	42.8%	33.0%
6. Mean EOG		$493 (2,670)	$563 (3,976)	$620 (3,036)
7. Mean total financial aid		$1056 (2,084)	$1236 (3,021)	$1333 (2,365)

An EOG may constitute no more than 50 per cent of a student's financial aid package. Outlined in the EOG Manual are the various sources of financial aid with which EOG's may be matched. Most schools report that financial aid is generally packaged for students according to established procedures, although this is somewhat less true of the private university and four-year college than of the public institutions. About half of the schools participating in the EOG program require that EOG students take a loan; similarly about half require that EOG recipients work at a term-time job. Two-year institutions, both public and private, are less likely to require loans but more likely to require that students work to supplement their EOG.[6]

Tables 5.4 and 5.5 present data on the kinds of financial aid received by students in different kinds of institutions. The data indicate that the policies reported (in Table 5.1) are translated into corresponding packaging practices. EOG's are matched with work-study employment most frequently at the public community college, least often at the private university. At the latter, an NDSL is likely to accompany the student's EOG. Similarly, the NDSL is least likely to be part of the student's financial aid package at the two-year public institution.

---

[6] Correspondingly, the two-year schools, especially the private ones, are less likely to lighten term-time job requirements for EOG students. (Section II, Appendix B.) They are more likely, however, to reduce a student's course load.

TABLE 5.4

THE PACKAGING OF FINANCIAL AID FOR STUDENTS BY RACIAL COMPOSITION OF STUDENT BODY[a]

Percentage of EOG Students with:	FAO Sample (10,163)	Racial Composition of School	
		Predominantly White (9,183)	Predominantly Black (980)
1. CWS and NDSL[b]	21.1%	20.7%	24.3%
2. CWS, not NDSL	19.3	18.6	25.8
3. NDSL, not CWS	39.2	39.7	34.4
4. Neither CWS nor NDSL	20.5	21.0	15.5
5. Guaranteed loan	10.7	11.6	2.3
6. State scholarship	16.9	18.4	2.7
7. Other scholarship	24.1	25.0	15.6

[a] See Appendix A, Table A.5.4 for packaging practices of schools in different regions and with different sizes of EOG programs.

[b] A printer's error resulted in the omission of the category "NDSL" on the Student Data Form which was completed by financial aid officers. The latter almost unanimously used the category "other loan" to note that students held an NDSL. Sixty-six per cent of the student sample, compared to 60 per cent of the FAO sample hold an NDSL. Cross-tabulation of the two samples shows an agreement rate of 82%, compared to a rate of 85 per cent agreement on CWS as a source of financial aid. Substituting the student's for the FAO's response in Table 5.4 results in no substantial difference in the findings, therefore we assume with confidence that the FAO response, regarding the student's NDSL, is reliable. (See Tables A5.7 and A5.8, Appendix A.)

TABLE 5.5

THE PACKAGING OF FINANCIAL AID BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND CONTROL

Percentage of Students with:	Public Univ (2,543)	Priv Univ (627)	Pub 4 (2,990)	Priv 4 (2,939)	Pub 2 (829)	Priv 2 (120)
1. CWS and NDSL	15.5	17.9	24.2	23.5	18.5	27.2
2. CWS, not NDSL	12.8	9.1	18.4	19.8	46.2	25.5
3. NDSL, not CWS	48.4	47.7	44.2	31.1	20.0	21.3
4. Neither CWS nor NDSL	23.2	25.4	13.1	25.6	15.3	26.0
5. Guaranteed loan	9.5	12.0	6.4	15.5	12.3	12.3
6. State scholarship	21.0	51.4	11.7	37.1	12.8	19.1
7. Other scholarship	24.0	37.0	21.8	24.3	14.8	20.0

Financial aid policies and practices obviously vary widely from one type of institution to another. The data confirm that financial aid personnel have adapted their procedures and practices both to the unique needs of their students as well as to the availability of alternative sources of matching funds for EOG awards.

The differences in packaging policy and practice that have been noted are hardly academic. For a financial aid package is received by a student, and the composition of the student's package has long range implications. A student whose package contains an NDSL faces the realization that a portion of his future income is already earmarked for repayment of his loan. A student whose package includes a CWS allocation requiring that he devote a maximum of fifteen hours a week to a job must budget his time accordingly.[7]

A great deal of discussion has centered about the extent to which loans vis-a-vis grants should comprise the major source of a student's financial aid. Loans have been both extolled and denounced as an effective means of enabling a needy student to obtain the benefits of higher education. Michael Clurman suggests, for example, that giving students sufficient money through government-subsidized loans will enable them to select a college regardless of tuition and will force colleges to improve their quality in order to compete for students.[8]

Hanford and Nelson wonder, on the other hand, whether loans are an effective way of equalizing educational opportunity. They note that " . . . even amateurs . . . recognize that a debt, particularly with nothing to show for it like a car or a house or a pair of shoes, can be anathema to someone for whom money has always been scarce."[9] They argue that the lower-middle class student, in particular, will suffer from an increased emphasis on loans, since the wealthier student can finance higher education without a loan and the really poor student will receive his assistance through grants and waivers. Furthermore, they claim that colleges and graduate schools will be populated primarily with students who are willing to take a financial risk, students who will shy away from the less lucrative, but perhaps more socially fruitful occupations (such as social work) in order to pay the large debts incurred for their education.[10]

---

[7] Within the next several months, data will be available on students' attitudes toward their College Work-Study jobs, and on the problems and benefits they report as a result of participating in the CWS program.

[8] Clurman, Michael, "How Shall We Finance Higher Education?" The Public Interest, Number 19, Spring 1970, pp. 98-110.

[9] Hanford, G. H. and Nelson, J. E., "Federal Student Loan Plans: The Dangers are Real," College Board Review, Number 75, Apring 1970, p. 18.

Most of all, Hanford and Nelson decry the lack of adequate data relating student financial aid sources and attitudes with family income.[11] The data we have collected, from both students and institutions, enable us to provide tentative answers to some of the questions raised by both sides in the battle over the effectiveness of the loan as a means of financing higher education for needy students.

Section II. Student Attitudes toward Financial Aid

In this section we present data on student attitudes toward grants, loans, and work as a means of paying for college and on the characteristics of students with different financial aid packages.

Table 5.6 provides ample evidence of the lack of consensus among EOG students about all three sources of financial aid. White students, for example, in every income category tend to take a more elitist attitude toward grants than do blacks. Whites, less frequently than blacks think that grants should be awarded to any needy student regardless of high academic promise.

---

[10] Ibid., pp. 18-19.

[11] Ibid., p. 21.

TABLE 5.6

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD KINDS OF FINANCIAL AID BY SELECTED STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Student Characteristics	Percentage of EOG Students Agreeing That:		
	Grants should be awarded to any student who wants to, but cannot afford to go to college	Working at a job during the school year should be avoided if at all possible	Borrowing money to pay for college should only be done as a last resort
1. Race and family income			
Less than $3000			
White	63.6% (1,092)	77.0% (1,078)	49.4% (1,084)
Black	77.4% (517)	83.5% (491)	40.3% (496)
$3000-5999			
White	62.8% (2,345)	79.4% (2,295)	49.3% (2,331)
Black	79.4% (683)	85.0% (660)	52.5% (657)
$6000-7499			
White	63.9% (976)	79.5% (956)	51.7% (975)
Black	78.5% (177)	93.1% (173)	54.6% (174)
$7500-8999			
White	65.8% (523)	78.5% (516)	51.3% (522)
Black	82.5% (57)	90.7% (54)	58.6% (58)
$9000 or more			
White	62.0% (334)	79.4% (330)	55.5% (328)
Black	80.0% (45)	88.1% (42)	61.4% (44)

TABLE 5.6--Continued

Selected Student Characteristics	Percentage of EOG Students Agreeing That: Grants should be awarded to any student who wants to, but cannot afford to go to college	Working at a job during the school year should be avoided if at all possible	Borrowing money to pay for college should only be done as a last resort
2. Student residence during high school			
Farm or ranch	64.4% (1,891)	76.0% (1,854)	41.8% (1,868)
Large city	72.7% (1,596)	86.1% (1,556)	58.9% (1,570)
3. Current sources of financial aid			
College Work-Study			
Yes	69.7% (3,182)	73.7% (3,083)	51.1% (3,137)
No	64.9% (4,750)	85.1% (4,662)	40.4% (4,692)
Other employment			
Yes	68.9% (684)	76.3% (667)	57.0% (684)
No	66.6% (7,248)	81.0% (7,078)	49.5% (7,145)
NDSL			
Yes	67.7% (4,708)	81.1% (4,715)	45.0% (4,757)
No	65.6% (3,024)	79.8% (3,030)	58.1% (3,072)
Guaranteed loan			
Yes	68.2% (840)	79.9% (822)	50.2% (838)
No	66.7% (7,072)	80.6% (6,923)	50.1% (6,991)
Other scholarship			
Yes	59.3% (1,985)	80.7% (1,947)	60.2% (1,972)
No	69.3% (5,947)	80.5% (5,798)	46.7% (5,857)

The attitude toward work also appears to be more a function of race than of income. In every income category, more black than white students feel that working to meet one's college expenses should be avoided if at all possible. On the average, almost 90 per cent of the black students, compared to 80 per cent of white students, agree that work should be avoided.

The attitude toward borrowing as a means of financing higher education appears to be a function of both income and race. Over half of both black and white students agree that borrowing to pay for college should be a last resort. For both races the higher one ascends the income scale, the more negative the attitude toward borrowing. This relationship, however, is more pronounced for black than for white students.

The student who comes from the farm or small town seems to be more "Protestant Ethic" oriented than the student stemming from the metropolis. The former is more ready to restrict grants to needy students with promise, to consider that it is better to work than to accept a grant, and to espouse loans as a good way to pay for college.

Generally, the variables which enter into the determination of a student's financial aid package are factors such as the size of EOG, CWS, NDSL allocations (if these programs exist at the institution), the number of applicants for aid, the extent of institutional funds, state scholarship and other monies with which to match EOG's, and other such financial factors. The attitudes of students toward various forms of financial aid rarely enter into the equation when the financial aid officer designs a package.

Since 80 per cent of the students feel that work should be avoided if possible, and 50 per cent feel that loans should constitute only a last resort, it might seem that great discontent would exist among the EOG students, 40 per cent of whom hold Work-Study jobs and over 60 per cent of whom have National Defense loans. Interestingly, however, the student's attitude toward work or borrowing seems to be more positive when he is enrolled in the Work-Study or NDSL programs, more negative when he is not. Perhaps the fear of working or borrowing is reduced once the student actually holds a term-time job or takes out a loan. While 58 per cent of those who do not have an NDSL agree that borrowing should be a last resort, 45 per cent of the students who do have a Defense loan agree with this statement. Similarly, 10 per cent fewer of the students holding Work-Study jobs than of those not in the Work-Study program feel that working during the school term should be avoided if at all possible.

That negative attitudes toward loans and work are greater among those who do not hold loans or jobs may be a result of self-selection for the various programs. Some financial aid officers indicated that if a student evidences strong feelings about borrowing or working they make every attempt to match his EOG with other sources of aid.[12] Obviously, however, this is not always feasible and it should be noted that in our sample of EOG students there are almost 2,400 students who hold work-study jobs but feel that work should be avoided; there are

---

[12] Some institutions include in their financial aid application form a question about the student's willingness to take a loan or to hold term-time employment.

2,000 students holding NDSL's who think that borrowing should be a last resort. If these feelings are salient, it is possible that there are large numbers of students on college campuses who are unhappy about their financial aid packages and that this unhappiness affects their overall satisfaction with college. Table 5.7 explores this question and the data seem to support the thesis that dissatisfaction with one's financial aid package and general dissatisfaction with college are related.

The lowest rate of general satisfaction in every instance is for the student who holds a College Work-Study job or an NDSL but is opposed to working or borrowing. In every instance, also, the rates of satisfaction are higher when a student's source of financial aid is congruent with his attitude toward that source as a means of financing college. This seems to be particularly true for black students when it is a matter of loans, for white students when it is a matter of work. In general, regardless of their attitudes, black students without CWS jobs or NDSL's are somewhat more satisfied with college generally; among white students, holding or not holding a CWS job or an NDSL appears to be unrelated to general satisfaction with college.[13]

Although the figures are not presented here, attitude toward work is related to student satisfaction in the same manner whether the student holds a CWS job or works at other term-time employment. The relationship of a student's attitude toward loans and his general

---

[13] It should be noted, parenthetically, that the white student, regardless of the source of or attitude toward financial aid, is almost twice as likely to report high satisfaction with college.

TABLE 5.7

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VERY SATISFIED WITH COLLEGE BY ATTITUDE TOWARD WORK AND LOANS AND BY WHETHER STUDENT WORKS OR HAS A LOAN

Black Students					
Holds CWS Job	Work Should be Avoided				
	No		Yes		% Difference
No	38.9%	(95)	32.8%	(673)	+6.1
Yes	32.2%	(115)	28.6%	(609)	+3.6
% Difference	+6.7		+4.2		
White Students					
No	58.3%	(516)	53.0%	(2,748)	+5.3
Yes	59.5%	(618)	51.0%	(1,432)	+8.5
% Difference	-1.2		+2.0		

Black Students					
Has NDSL	Borrowing Should be a Last Resort				
	No		Yes		% Difference
No	39.1%	(274)	30.0%	(327)	+9.1
Yes	35.6%	(494)	24.8%	(403)	+10.8
% Difference	+3.5		+5.2		
White Students					
Has NDSL					
No	51.5%	(822)	51.5%	(1,199)	0.0
Yes	57.7%	(1,855)	51.8%	(1,509)	+5.9
% Difference	-5.2		-0.3		

satisfaction, however, is unrelated to whether he holds a guaranteed loan.

In sum, attitudes toward grants, work, and loans differ by race, by income, by where the student grew up, and by whether the student actually does work or holds a loan. The data also suggest that dissatisfaction with the form in which a financial aid is packaged may be diffused into general dissatisfaction with the college.

It is possible, of course, that the dissatisfaction with college of students may stem from many other factors than their financial aid packages. An investigation into the various components of student satisfaction would be peripheral to the objectives of this report. However, even if the relationships in Table 5.7 proved to be spurious, the raw data tell us that there are large numbers of students working who feel that employment during the school year should be avoided and large numbers with loans who feel that borrowing should be a last resort.

We do not suggest the elimination of these forms of financial aid. Greater awareness on the part of administrators, however, of the fears and concerns of students on these matters is called for, as is closer collaboration between student and aid officer in the designing of a student's financial aid package.

The question of who receives various forms of financial aid (in addition to the EOG) still remains to be answered.

Briefly, Table 5.8 shows that EOG's are more frequently packaged with Work-Study for black students, especially those at the lowest

TABLE 5.8

SOURCE OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID BY CHARACTERISTICS OF EOG STUDENTS

Student Characteristics	Source of Federal Financial Aid				Total
	CWS and NDSL	CWS not NDSL	NDSL not CWS	Neither CWS nor NDSL (EOG only)	
1. Race and family income					
Under $3000					
Black	25.8%	24.8%	34.0%	15.3%	(770)
White	24.5	19.3	40.8	15.3	(1,349)
$3000-5999					
Black	25.0	22.9	35.2	16.8	(1,022)
White	21.4	18.3	40.8	19.5	(2,815)
$6000-7499					
Black	22.0	24.8	32.3	20.9	(282)
White	20.3	16.7	42.1	20.9	(1,127)
$7500-8999					
Black	19.8	19.8	42.6	17.8	(101)
White	17.5	16.1	44.4	22.0	(622)
$9000 or more					
Black	15.6	18.8	37.5	28.1	(64)
White	17.6	17.4	43.5	21.5	(391)
2. Mean additional aid needed to meet expenses	$410 (656)	$412 (589)	$430 (1,202)	$432 (674)	$421 (3,121)
3. Mean total financial aid	$1381 (1,655)	$1156 (1,457)	$1200 (3,093)	$1157 (1,549)	$1218 (7,754)

TABLE 5.8--Continued

Student Characteristics	Source of Federal Financial Aid				Total
	CWS and NDSL	CWS not NDSL	NDSL not CWS	Neither CWS nor NDSL (EOG only)	
4. Mean EOG	$608 (2,132)	$527 (1,949)	$557 (3,974)	$558 (2,011)	$562 (10,066)
5. Transfer student					
Yes	22.7%	16.7%	44.1%	16.4%	(1,149)
No	21.0	19.4	38.9	20.7	(8,620)
6. Type of grant					
Initial year	20.1	21.9	36.9	21.1	(4,345)
3rd year renewal	18.5	14.0	46.1	21.4	(763)
7. Mean family income	$4572 (2,009)	$4628 (1,827)	$4875 (3,760)	$4933 (1,863)	$4775 (9,459)
8. Student has other scholarship					
Yes	17.4%	19.0%	32.2%	31.4%	(2,447)
No	22.2%	19.4%	41.4%	17.0%	(7,719)
9. Student has guaranteed loan					
Yes	7.3%	28.9%	18.8%	45.1%	(1,092)
No	22.7%	18.1%	41.7%	17.5%	(9,074)
10. Student has state scholarship					
Yes	12.1%	19.1%	32.1%	36.7%	(1,719)
No	22.9%	19.3%	40.7%	17.2%	(8,447)

income level, for students with guaranteed loans, and for initial year (freshmen) students. An NDSL is more likely to be part of the financial aid package of transfer students, of students at the highest income level, of third year renewal students (seniors) and appears more frequently as a component of the package for white students. The entire package (EOG, CWS, NDSL) is most commonly received by black, low-income students, while students with other forms of financial aid (guaranteed loans, state scholarships, other scholarships) most commonly receive an EOG without either CWS or NDSL. As might be expected, the total amount of financial aid as well as the size of the EOG is greatest for students with the full package.

Further documentation of institutional packaging practices is afforded by the Fiscal-Operations data collected in 1969. These data report on all students in institutions participating in one or more of the three major federally funded programs. They indicate, as can be seen in Table 5.9 that EOG's are being channeled to the minority students, particularly those who are black.

More than 20 per cent fewer blacks than white students receive no EOG; on the contrary, almost twice the proportion of black as of white students have been provided with EOG, NDSL, and CWS--that is, with the complete federally funded financial package.

TABLE 5.9

PACKAGING OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID BY RACE
(Fiscal-Operations Data 1969)

Student's Race	Source of Federal Financial Aid					Total
	EOG only	CWS and EOG	NDSL and EOG	All Three	CWS and NDSL (no EOG)	
Black	12.5%	7.4%	18.0%	13.1%	49.0%	(115,026)
American Indian	10.0	8.7	15.1	7.6	58.7	(2,669)
Oriental-American	11.2	5.4	14.0	6.4	63.0	(6,576)
Spanish-surnamed American	14.8	6.3	15.5	9.1	54.3	(28,900)
White	5.9	3.2	14.3	7.3	69.3	(588,772)

The data presented in this chapter may be summarized as follows:

(1) Institutions differ substantially when it comes to policies regarding the packaging of financial aid to students.

(2) These differences are translated into concrete packing practices.

(3) Policies and practices appear to be a function of
   (a) characteristics of students receiving financial aid
   (b) availability of alternative sources of financial aid (endowments, state support) to serve as matching funds for EOG's.

(4) Student attitudes toward grants, work and loans are related both to their actual financial aid package and to their family income and ethnic background. Lack of congruence between attitude and actual package may cause a diffuse dissatisfaction with college.

(5) Fiscal-Operations data indicate that student financial aid personnel are focusing EOG's on minority students; a higher proportion of white than black students receive no EOG. Twice the proportion of black as white students (who are aided under the three major federally funded programs, receive the complete financial aid package: EOG, CWS, and NDSL.

CHAPTER SIX

THE SITE VISITS

Section I: Program Contexts

Section I of this chapter sketches the concrete, varied contexts in which EOG funds reach low income and minority students. This summary is based on Site Visit Reports prepared by five members of the research staff following their interviews with over 100 college administrators and students on twenty campuses across the nation. Interviews were typically held with the financial aid officer, an academic dean, special program personnel, and several students.

Growth. Nearly every institution displays visible evidence of moderate to tremendous growth. It is not uncommon to see buildings less than ten years old which are already full to bursting, with subdivided offices, and which are adjoined by pre-fabricated or other temporary structures crowding the available spaces among permanent buildings. Parking is often a formidable problem. The design of the entire campus as it existed not many years before can be detected sometimes, like the medieval quarters of a European city, in one corner of a campus full of new buildings in different architectural styles. Often one building bears, anachronistically, a title like "Administration," whereas administrative functions are dispersed among a half dozen buildings.

Enrollment figures for 17 of the 20 institutions indicate that average enrollment has increased from about 3,500 to about 5,500 between 1958 and 1966.* The three remaining institutions opened their doors for the first time after 1958,** documenting the growth of college enrollment in a different fashion. The newest college visited is three years old. Its physical plant consists of two prefabricated buildings, yet its enrollment is already 3,000 and it plans to open facilities on two campuses at opposite ends of the city it serves.

Figures are available for black enrollment at 16 of the 20 institutions for the briefer interval from fall 1968 to fall 1970. During these two years, average total enrollment declined from about 5,900 to 5,700, while average black enrollment in the same period increased from about 550 to 640.*** (The decline in total enrollment is accounted for by the loss of 5,000 students at one institution.)

Increased Complexity and Diversity. Respondents on the 20 campuses reported the emergence of new administrative functions performed by offices such as: institutional development, research and evaluation, financial aid, special education, developmental skills, and curriculum development and planning. They noted shifts from narrow to broadened educational objectives and statuses, from teachers' education to liberal arts and sciences, from two-year to four-year, from four-year to university, from exclusively male or female to co-educational enrollment.

---

*American Council of Education, American Colleges and Universities, 8th and 10th editions.

**They are Miami Dade Junior College, 1960; Mt. St. Mary College (Newburg, N.Y.), 1960; and Community College of Denver, 1968.

***Data were unavailable for Bacone College, Community College of Denver, and Mt. St. Mary College for fall 1968, and were unavailable from Temple University for fall 1970. Source: Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. III, No. 16 and Vol. V, No. 25.

The colleges visited unanimously reported attempts to broaden the racial composition of their student bodies. For example, a state-supported institution describing its locale as a "lily-white retirement community" has undertaken in a three-year period to bring in hundreds of black students, including many from ghetto areas in a nearby urban center. A previously all Negro institution has purchased spot advertisements on local radio stations, announcing its accessibility to white students in the community. Other advertisements report black enrollment at a nearby university, where attitudes were reported previously to have been hostile to blacks. An "Indian college" vigorously disputes the appropriateness of the term "Indian." This school has started in a small way to recruit black students from out of state, and is more vigorously recruiting white commuter students. Land has been sold to the town to form a site for a new high school to be built near the campus, further advertising the college to white students.

In each of these settings, college officials are stressing the educational value of communication among races and ethnic groups, mutual understanding, and benefits to the institution arising from plural intellectual goals based upon differing talents of students. Where the majority is white, administrators foresee that it will also benefit from the advent of non-whites; benefits flow in both directions.

In principle if not always in practice, the "melting pot," embedded in the history of public secondary schools, seems now firmly established in the nation's colleges and universities, whether public or private.

The Invisible Poverty Student. If black, Spanish-American, and Indian students appear to receive official welcomes from college administrators, this is not now the case for the poverty student. Independently of racial or ethnic status, the student from a low-income family does not occupy an officially-sponsored niche in college. Only one college visited, located in a barren rural area where unemployment has recently become more severe, has witnessed the establishment of a "Poor White" student organization. Black, Indian, and Chicano students on this campus had earlier formed their own organizations. The salient identities of many recently organized programs for "disadvantaged" students evidently arise from the fact that many of the disadvantaged are also from minority group backgrounds, rather than from the fact that all participants fall into low income categories.

In many colleges robust ethnic identities are being fostered, sometimes with notable support from the community and mass media, while the economic classification "low income" is pushed to the side and is not the focus of organizational efforts. Ethnicity and race are highly visible attributes of students which are correlated with low income, and in some circumstances they tend to "steal the show" from the poverty criterion formally identifying programs for the disadvantaged. Specific patterns of ethnic or racial cooptation will be discussed below.

Section II: Program Administration

Although virtually all colleges bear the marks of growth, increasing complexity, diversifying student enrollments, and broadening curricular and educational goals, these have been channeled into patterns with distinctive administrative consequences.

Size and Administrative Roles. Probably the single overarching dimension distinguishing colleges is size. Size has manifold consequences upon both the formal, administrative structure of the institutions and upon the interactions and the general "feel" of the college environment. With increasing size, researchers met progressively complex, formalized channels within the administrative structures of institutions. For example, the financial aid officer of one small institution (enrollment about 700) also manages night-time athletic events, teaches a commercial aviation course, is responsible for relations with the federal government, recruits students to the college, and actively counsels many students. These are his roles at the moment, but his roles change with the fluctuating availability of other talents among the teacher-administrators at the college. Even the president of this small college, and certainly the academic dean, feel the need to teach at least one course. Administrative duties are parceled out on a "catch as catch can" basis; often the only mandate for office is a conversation with the president.

Administrators in the small college are over-burdened. There is evidence of clumsiness and ineffectiveness due to attempts by harassed and untrained staff to direct multiple efforts. The part-time administrator of over-lapping state and Federal programs has neither time nor sophistication to master bureaucratic intricacies and periodic shifts in policy and permissible practice. Furthermore, his sheltered career in a small institution makes him overly hesitant and timid about trying even those approaches about which he has been informed. One administrator, whose career began as a teacher of business arithmetic, reports that he at first believed that since some students were receiving support from one state financial aid program, they were ineligible for "incentive" awards from another. Strictures in program manuals regarding responsibility for the management of public funds take on a foreboding cast. One timid administrator remarked that he sometimes expects to spend his "retirement" in prison once government auditors find their way to his school.

Advancing from the small college to the college of moderate size involves more formal office procedures and graded levels of personnel. The financial aid administrator reports to the administrative vice president. The aid administrator directs a staff which includes an assistant director and two or three counselor-interviewers, as well as clerks. Sometimes there is a small field staff, which recruits students in conjunction with the admissions office. The financial aid administrator in the moderate size institution continues to see some students himself, especially since he remembers that a few years before the financial aid office had been a "one man show," and because his own background may well be in teaching, counseling, or student personnel. Yet if he continues to see students, this aspect of his job begins to take on a purely symbolic significance. He "points with pride" to the fact that he still sees students, just as the academic dean or other administrators often still teach a class or two. The moderate size college is somewhat uncomfortable with purely bureaucratic roles; to be counted of and not merely in the college, it is best to retain academic, or at least counseling, credentials.

The financial aid officer in the moderate size institution may also have multiple administrative duties, though these will be closely related to financial matters, or student admissions. He must narrow his activities because, after all, he administers a budget which may reach a half million dollars. The financial aid officer often commits his institution in the spring to support an unknown number of students who have been offered admission and who will in turn accept the invitation (and the proffered aid) in April or May. The financial aid officer, however, does not know how many and how needy the students who finally enroll in the college will be, and he must also proffer aid before knowing the amount of Congressional (and often, state) appropriations. In addition, programs for disadvantaged students at an institution may require that participants receive support above and beyond established levels of aid. Sometimes the aid administrator views with a jaundiced eye the "coddling" of special program students who receive large aid packages while academically more promising students go without support. Then too, special programs in colleges also show propensities for last-minute funding in the spring, recruitment and hasty planning in the summer, and brave beginnings in the fall.

In the large institution, the financial aid officer has been thoroughly won to the bureaucratic cause. He seldom deals with students; his daily round keeps him entirely within administrative ranks. Here, the financial aid officer stresses his fiscal responsibilities, the size of the budget which his office administers, his professional roles, and his contacts at state, regional, and national levels. Often, the large institution administrator oversees the operations of several branch financial aid offices at dispersed campuses within a university or state college system. Some programs of moderate size are still operated "by hand" (a single register contains students' names, class rank, family income, estimated need, and financial aid package), but the large program administrator relies on machine technology usually operated in a facility outside his own department.

Public vs. Private Control and Reception of EOG. Private college administrators are more concerned than their colleagues in the public sector about the rising costs of education and about their worsening competitive position vis-à-vis high quality public institutions. Even elite private colleges with large endowments report increasing defections among middle and upper-middle class families, who no longer believe that their children's enrollment in the best private colleges gives them a significant advantage over enrollment in the best public colleges. These administrators are unsympathetic to the needs analysis tables developed by the College Scholarship Service. They feel that the "equal sacrifice" principle is clearly violated in the case of the family whose income of $15,000 to $30,000 is inadequate to support two children in private colleges, or one child in college and one in a private secondary school.

The administrators in the private colleges are also acutely aware of what one termed the "hidden costs" of EOG participation. The college with a 90 per cent or better retention rate often defends its Renewal Year awards from cuts down to the expected retention rate of 65 per cent. The elite private institutions lead many other institutions in undertaking a firm commitment to see that no admitted student drops out for financial reasons. This commitment must sometimes be maintained from additional institutional funds when federal appropriations are less than projected.* As college costs rise, and when the low-income student's family situation worsens (in contrast to the usual income growth of middle class families), the college finds itself providing more and more support above the $1000 maximum EOG.

In broader areas, some private college administrators contend that their institutions are being "cheated" by the present situation in higher education. After all, they argue, public institutions were being supported by tax monies long before the advent of the EOG program. Although private colleges often provide special curricular opportunities, and a "tailor-made" education uniquely helpful to disadvantaged students, few students can be recruited into these programs because the schools still must search for the much needed support not provided by the maximum EOG, as well as funds to offset the "hidden costs" described above. One administrator argues that the overall standard for apportioning public money to the colleges should be:: What apportioning will result in the lowest cost to the taxpayer for each student educated? He maintains that it would be far more costly to duplicate existing private college facilities in order to expand public education, than to increase public support of the private college. Many private college administrators adopt a rather critical attitude toward existing federal aid programs, including the EOG program, based upon a position that private colleges are receiving insufficient public support. Each program is evaluated in terms of its broad impact on the colleges' financial position, rather than in terms of specific program goals. The primary question asked of the EOG program, as of others, seems to be: How is it helping our beleaguered position? rather than: How is it fulfilling the purposes for which it was established?

---

*In Chapter Four it was seen that 74 per cent of the private universities set aside institutional funds for this purpose.

On the other hand, the public institutions visited are hardly content with their present levels of financial support. It appears, however, that public institution administrators acquiesce more to outside direction over deployment of financial resources than do private administrators. The public administrator is used to a contracting and budgeting arrangement whereby income to his institution is pre-targeted to specific programs and purposes. The private college administrator, on the other hand, appears to expect unrestricted or nearly unrestricted income from outside sources (both public and private) and reserves to himself responsibility for allocation to institutional needs. It is perhaps this variation in the administrative traditions of the two types of institutions which accounts for the more extensive criticisms of EOG by the private colleges. Among administrators in private colleges and universities, there is usually a shared consensus on important goals of the institution. The administrator's loyalty is primarily to his institution rather than to a professional specialty, or to one program or department within his institution. It is this global perspective and loyalty which perhaps also prompts the private administrator into heightened scrutiny of and sensitivity to programs originating from outside.

Section III: Special Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged

Wherever possible, researchers contacted personnel working in special programs for disadvantaged students. Although an in-depth study of these programs was not possible, four general descriptions or "models" of special programs emerge from the visits.

Programs in Minority Institutions. Several institutions visited have long been devoted to the education of minority students. In these institutions, EOGs are awarded to students who are economically least advantaged, but who are in an ethnic and racial milieu which in no way sets them off from other students. Indeed, even in economic terms, the student enrollments in the minority colleges are homogeneous: decisions as to which students will be awarded EOG's are difficult.

The minority institutions visited are not newcomers to the task of educating disadvantaged students. Rather than providing a distinctive educational focus on the disadvantaged student as a subtype with unique problems, these institutions have modified the traditional curriculum in order to solve pervasive educational difficulties among their students. For example, one institution has developed a "track system" dividing its students into three groups according to their performance on standardized tests and in high school. Placement in the lowest track requires a student to stretch one three-hour a week course into five hours. The student still earns only three credits for this course; though he attends classes fifteen hours a week, he earns only twelve credits for the semester in which he is enrolled in one of these lengthened courses.

A similar effort in another minority institution is labelled a "core program." There, the student lacking adequate academic preparation is enrolled in a fixed curriculum stressing basic language and mathematics skills. After he has successfully completed this coursework, he progresses to elective subjects at a more advanced level. In both institutions, there appears to be relatively little onus attached to enrollment in the lower level offerings. Many students are enrolled in this curriculum, and it has traditional standing within the institution. Since students are taught by instructors who teach courses at higher levels as well, they are not highly visible to other students as being enrolled in a remedial program.

Counseling-Plus Programs. A prevalent pattern in colleges which are not minority institutions, but which have identified many educationally disadvantaged students, is to provide tutors and counselors for students, and one or two credit-earning courses designed to prepare these students for general work at the institution. Counselors, tutors, and instructors are usually linked under one program framework, although there appears to be great variation in the structure and goals of the programs. Tutors may be drawn from among experienced teachers in local public high schools, older students in the college who have responded to appeals from the student government, or students recruited through placement and employment offices. Counselors, on the other hand, are often drawn from among recent graduates of the institution, and other young persons preparing for professional careers in guidance, student personnel work, and related fields.

The course offerings accompanying tutoring and counseling orient the student to college work, inform him of what will be expected of him in college, and introduce him to resources at his disposal within the institution. Many program philosophies stress, as well, that the college training which is offered the student is one among several routes to occupational goals. These philosophies emphasize that the student must individually evaluate the college's offerings in terms of his goals and aptitudes. We found that while the "counseling-plus" program in the non-minority institution stresses an individualistic orientation for the student, the minority institution often stresses a group-centered outlook, pointing to the positive influence of the student's accomplishments for other minority group members.

Intensive Education Programs. Schools with large minority enrollments frequently augment a counseling-plus framework with a wider range of subjects for which the student earns academic credit. Additional efforts at language skill training, including special reading laboratories and work stressing concept formation, and specially developed science courses stressing taxonomic approaches, such as in biology, are examples of these efforts. Admission into the intensive education program normally depends upon evaluations of the student on the basis of standardized test scores and past performance. Institutions which primarily rely upon special recruitment of minority and disadvantaged students have usually identified intensive education students prior to the beginning of the academic year. Students remain in a specialized curriculum for varying lengths of time, depending both on the level of their performance and on the type of experience they are receiving through the program.

Unlike the track system or core program of the minority institution, the intensive education program in the non-minority institution frequently arouses students' prejudices against the "stigma" attached to program participation. Students who are not enrolled in the program but who hear about it often misunderstand the program's objectives. Programs not organized along racial lines but with high black enrollment will be mis-perceived as directed solely to black students. Programs with a dual mission of vocational counseling and remedial education will be perceived as directed solely to "dumb" students. Those enrolled in the special program are of course not immune to the perceptions of the program by other students. They often are led to reject further participation in the program not because they are dissatisfied with the program's approach but because they are smarting under the disapproval of their peers. One college administration attempted to register special program students separately from other students, hoping to avoid invidious comparisons between the two student groups. The special students were quick to detect this protective treatment, and insisted that they be registered at the usual time. The advantage of the minority institution in achieving a favorable reception to special educational and counseling efforts appears to lie in the smoother gradation in levels of ability among the minority college's student body, as compared with the non-minority institution. Students in the minority institution who are enrolled in the highest level offerings are not unaware of or unsympathetic to the problems of the other students.

The apparently successful reception of some intensive education programs in other institutions suggests that it is the visible segregation of the program, and the manifest disparity in academic ability between program and non-program students, which undercuts acceptance. Administrators who report successful acceptance of special programs also report frequently that they have reduced the visibility of the program by integrating it as fully as possible with mainstream activities in the institution. One institution adopted an undistinctive program title, minimized the production of special pamphlets and other material advertising and describing the program, and turned over much of the program's administrative and teaching functions to regular university offices and departments. The program's administrators feel that this approach minimizes the program's cost, and integrates students in the program with other students on campus.

Ethnic Studies Programs. Ethnic studies programs in principle introduce new academic content into the college curriculum, rather than attempt counseling, remedial education, or intensive education. However, the target group or audience for the ethnic studies effort is frequently the same group about which special education and counseling efforts center. The intensive education effort which begins without a racial or ethnic emphasis sometimes develops this emphasis as the program matures. Outsiders may perceive the program in this light and thereby force the issue, or special program administrators and participants themselves may seek to revamp the academic content of the program in racial or ethnic terms. One instance in which this latter pattern developed will be described in some detail, though there is no evidence as to its general relevance.

Administrators at a large publicly supported institution which had shown tremendous enrollment growth but little increase in minority enrollments decided to use available state and federal funds to recruit and support several hundred minority students. The atmosphere surrounding this decision was described by one administrator as "liberals' concerns for the plight of minority disadvantaged students." It was hoped that these students could be helped to obtain what the institution had to offer. A special staff was hired and a recruitment effort was launched reaching into ghetto communities. Parallel attempts were also made to alter some of the institution's traditional academic offerings. Special language courses were inaugurated, team-teaching was introduced into some beginning level courses set aside for the new students, and a system of grading was also experimented with whereby students working together on joint projects would each receive a grade for the work completed.

From the viewpoint of the original planners, these innovations are rather far-reaching. Much work was required with each academic department to change teaching methods in a manner helpful to the incoming special students. In this same period, however, departments at the institution were advancing into university-level courses and were quite sensitive to threats to their recently elevated standards of research and scholarship. Teachers did not allow outside supervision over their classrooms. Many were quite reluctant to submit course outlines to the academic officer who was attempting to coordinate the new educational efforts.

From the point of view of the newly hired staff directing the effort, however, these reforms were both ineffective and proceeding in the wrong direction. What is really required, they argue, is not remediation to educate the black and other minority students into the existing curriculum, but, rather, a new curriculum centering upon the experiences, outlooks, and cultural values of these students. If the black student has difficulty learning the subject matter in courses as traditionally taught, that is because these courses are embedded within a white rather than a black cultural matrix. New teachers should be hired for the new curriculum. Courses should be taught in the dialects of the minority students by teachers from minority backgrounds. The recruiting staff plans to triple the minority student enrollment for next year, probably outstripping the capacity of the university to support the program. When asked to evaluate this consequence, the special program administrator replied that it would illustrate the institution's lack of real commitment to the minority student program, since funds could be available if other priorities were downgraded.

Although this pattern of development was observed at only one institution, no other institution visited is equally active in recruiting minority students, or presents as large a gap between special program and other students. Though regular administrators and the program staff are in disagreement over both the goals of the program and the means to be employed to reach goals, there is an underlying agreement upon one significant point: if large-scale efforts are not made, many of the specially admitted students will quickly fail within the old system. The remediation emphasis of the original planners attempts to forestall the expected failure of the students by softening some academic standards and intensifying efforts to teach the students. The insurgent staff seek instead to re-define the institution by altering its goals. The core of their approach can be viewed as denying that academic failure attaches to the minority student himself, it attaches rather to the surrounding institution. Although this denial involves the insurgent staff in rather inflammatory rhetoric, other administrators in the institution tolerate their radicalism without, however, trying to reconcile it with conflicting university goals. Minority enrollment is still only 3 per cent at this large institution, and it can be guessed that the strong, positive definition of the special program provided by these administrators is of significant help to ghetto students.

It was seen that some institutions attempt to minimize the self-consciousness (and feelings of inferiority) of program participants by adopting chameleon-like procedures and reducing the visibility of "core programs." The example just cited, however, utilizes a totally different approach. It denies the inferiority of program participants by consciously promoting separatist ethnic rather than broad institutional loyalties. (Indeed, the surrounding institution is sometimes defined as an "enemy" of program participants.)

The size of an institution appears to crucially determine which of these polar approaches will be adopted. In a small (or even moderate size school) with everyday primary contacts among students, faculty, and administrators, separatist tendencies among minority groups are suppressed. The larger institution tolerates separatism. More than that, however, its complex, bureaucratic setting may heighten the isolation and insecurity of minority (and other) students, promoting a separatist response. The scope and pervasiveness of institutional goals is a second likely determinant of ethnic separatism. In the denominational college, for example, where institutional goals and climates press more heavily on each undergraduate, separatist tendencies will be minimized.*

---

*One school visited illustrates both of these determinants. A small denominational college with a strong community focus had begun to

Section IV: Recommendations

In Section IV we summarize criticisms and suggestions made by financial aid administrators concerning features of the EOG program. Based upon the site visits, we attempt to diagnose the situation of financial aid administrators themselves; we present these informal findings, as well, with the proviso that they are tentative.*

Unified Policy Goals. Many financial aid administrators, and especially those in small and moderate size institutions, view federal financial aid programs in a global fashion. Requirements for "matching" EOG's encourage the administrator to see the three programs in this light. Yet some administrators are puzzled by what they feel to be conflicting goals for the three programs. Income ceilings are not uniform, and originally the NDSL Program responded to the financial need of the student with academic promise. One administrator is curious to know how he can truthfully certify that EOG's are awarded to students "otherwise unable to attend college" when, in fact, students could obviously survive by being given more loans and/or work-study support. It appears useful to develop a systematic statement of

---

bring minority students to its campus. The minority students framed demands for separate living quarters and for special curriculum offerings. Though these demands were agreed to by the administration, minority freshmen entering in the second year of the program expressed a desire to rejoin other students in the regular dormitories. They argued that they had come to this college to experience what it had to offer them; they would have attended a minority college if they had wanted minority group separation.

*In the Summary and Recommendations (Chapter i) we present specific recommendations stemming from our data.

the goals of the three federal financial aid programs; if differences in goals emerge, these probably should be set forth explicitly, rather than left to be inferred by individual financial aid administrators from separate statements.

Broader Communication of Policy Goals. Much of the success of EOG hinges upon decisions and cooperation of college administrators and faculty other than financial aid administrators. The recruitment of disadvantaged students and their academic support is outside the purview of the financial aid officer. Researchers frequently found that personnel engaged in these vital efforts were uninformed of the purposes and nature of EOG and the other federal financial aid programs. A broader spectrum of communication between federal student financial aid programs and college administrators and faculty might help to bind the federal effort into complementary interaction with local institutional programs as well as with other federal (or state) programs at work in the institution. At a minimum, a pamphlet briefly describing the programs and formulating their goals could be publicized to administrators and faculty.

Career Development for Financial Aid Administrators. Researchers encountered wide variation in the status of financial aid administrators in the institutions included in the site visits. In some institutions, it appeared that the financial aid administrator was tacitly classified as performing duties analogous to those of a bookkeeper or at most a business manager, without exerting significant educational impact on the institution. Often the relatively low status of the financial aid administrator appeared to be a "survival" from the recent past when there were few funds for the education of the disadvantaged and perhaps even less institutional commitment to this effort. Wider communication of federal student financial aid policies within the institution, as suggested above, may have the indirect effect of bolstering the financial aid administrator's status. In any event, EOG would benefit from an increase in the professional stature of the financial aid administrator. For example, one capable and well-regarded administrator described overlapping employment programs in his institution, some designed to help needy students, others merely responsive to the need for student services. This administrator was able to reconcile these programs, publicize them to students, and simultaneously expand his leverage in helping needy students. Much of what he was able to do appeared to rest on his acceptance among administrators as a colleague with a significant task to perform and valuable skills with which to approach this task.

Several aid administrators complain of the rapid turnover among financial aid personnel. They point out that newcomers must be constantly introduced to aid programs, often without previous financial aid experience. To the extent that this turnover exists and reflects the low status of the financial aid officer, federal programs are being hindered by the absence of a "professionalized" financial aid role. Part of the investment in regional workshops and other means of training new waves of financial aid officers might be usefully diverted to or supplemented by efforts to retain these personnel where their experience and competence can accumulate to the benefit of aid programs. Of course the financial aid administrator can hardly be insulated from the other roles in middle level administration towards which he is drawn. Another approach to be considered is to anticipate that the aid officer role will be filled by many on their way up the middle management ladder, and encourage broader training for this role in curricula of higher educational administration.

Developing Commitment among Aid Administrators. Most financial aid administrators have been successfully won to the cause of educating minority/disadvantaged students. Some few aid officers, however, retain traditional attitudes that academic promise should be assessed at face value as the student comes through the door, and that this factor, as well as need, should determine the distribution of scarce aid resources. No doubt in some instances this attitude is reinforced by the tendency to evaluate program success by the percentage retention of students. These figures can obviously be improved if manifest academic promise is taken into account along with need. Research findings which show the reciprocal influences of academic attainment and income might bolster the administrator's confidence that the low-income student's academic potential is suppressed by his background rather than non-existent.

The rush to meet the challenge of educating minority/disadvantaged students also has sometimes left the financial aid administrator behind. Some institutions have established separate programs to recruit and support minority/disadvantaged students without including the financial aid administrator as a partner in these efforts. Measures which would increase coordination between financial aid officers and administrators of special programs might also further commitment to program goals among financial aid officers.

CHAPTER SEVEN

COMPONENTS OF PROGRAM "SUCCESS"

Introduction

Until this point the report has been primarily descriptive. We have described the EOG students, his socio-economic and academic background as well as his current status and future plans. The characteristics of the institutions participating in the EOG program have been examined and differences in the extent and effectiveness of recruitment, admissions, and supportive programs have been noted. Financial aid policies and practices in different kinds of institutions have been presented as well as the attitudes of students toward various forms of financial aid.

The descriptions of student characteristics and institutional activities which have emerged are themselves indicators of the successful operation of the program--and of its weak points. In this chapter, however, we go beyond description and turn to an analysis of the components of program "success."

The EOG program, it must be remembered, is operating within different institutional contexts. It would be naive to suppose therefore that program success can be monolithically assessed. What the program can accomplish at any given type of institution--be it public, private, small, large, denominational, or selective--is limited on the one hand, or enhanced on the other, by the nature of its student body, by the community in which it is located, by its institutional resources, and by a myriad of other factors. A small proportion of minority students receiving EOG's at one institution may be as much an indicator of program "success" as a large proportion at another school. Similarly, as was seen in Chapter Four, absence of recruitment activity on the part of an institution may not constitute an indicator of program "failure." We make no attempt in this chapter to *evaluate* program success--either on the whole or for different types of institutions. We will, however, point out some of the problems which financial aid personnel have mentioned and some of the effects *they* state the program has had. These problems and effects can then be related to perceptions of the success of the program as well as to other indicators of success.

Section I. *Administrative Problems*

It has been argued that one measure of the success of a program is the extent to which those responsible for its implementation encounter problems in the course of administering it from day to day. Directives, rules, and guidelines may work perfectly well in theory, but when applied to the everyday operation of the program are often found lacking. Similarly, the unique situation (geographical location, student characteristics, personnel, curriculum) of a college may raise problems for the administrators of the program. Trying to wrestle with these problems, in turn, may inhibit achieving program goals.

It is possible that rather than detracting from a program's successful achievement of goals, problems are a natural byproduct of an active imaginative effort to implement these goals. We take no a priori position therefore as to the correlation between the extent or severity of problems reported by aid officers and program success. Rather, in this section, some of the problems encountered by financial aid officers will be outlined and then correlated with institutional and student characteristics.

Table 7.1 presents data on the extent to which aid administrators regard certain aspects of the program as problems. Undoubtedly, EOG Branch personnel are cognizant of financial aid officers' complaints about the lateness of congressional notification of funding. Except for two-year schools, well over half find late funding a major problem since they have to make aid commitments to students before they actually know the amount of their allocation. During the site visits, most of the aid administrators with whom we spoke stated that three year funding would permit them greater flexibility and would relieve the perennial anxiety and insecurity under which they operated.

Estimating IY funds that will be needed seems to constitute more of a problem than does estimating RY funds. This may be because if RY estimates prove too low, transfers can be made from IY monies, but not vice versa. In Chapter Five it was seen that the result of inadequate IY funds is stretching of the allocation to cover more students which may be a feasible practice at the low tuition public schools, but which is difficult for schools in the private sector.

Furthermore, IY's are somewhat of a blind item, in comparison with RY's. Recruitment activities may be introducing to the campus a

TABLE 7.1

ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS REPORTED BY FINANCIAL AID PERSONNEL BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND CONTROL

Administrative Problems	Public Univ.	Private Univ.	Public Four-Year	Private Four-Year	Public Two-Year	Private Two-Year
1. Timing of funding notification	(116)	(52)	(259)	(654)	(392)	(115)
A major problem	58.6%	69.2%	56.0%	62.5%	42.6%	47.8%
A minor problem	31.9	19.2	30.1	29.8	41.8	39.1
No problem	9.5	11.5	13.9	7.6	15.6	13.0
2. Estimating IY Funds*	(115)	(52)	(261)	(661)	(398)	(122)
A major problem	20.9%	28.8%	17.6%	34.9%	26.6%	32.0%
A minor problem	55.7	48.1	56.3	51.9	51.5	45.9
No problem	23.5	23.1	26.1	13.2	21.9	22.1
3. Estimating RY Funds**	(116)	(53)	(261)	(661)	(393)	(122)
A major problem	12.9%	18.9%	15.3%	14.5%	22.4%	15.6%
A minor problem	62.9	52.8	55.9	53.7	57.0	63.1
No problem	24.1	28.3	28.7	31.8	20.6	21.3
4. Keeping informed about changes in program	(115)	(52)	(262)	(660)	(397)	(122)
A major problem	8.7%	7.7%	5.7%	11.4%	18.4%	13.9%
A minor problem	31.1	34.6	36.4	39.2	47.1	52.5
No problem	60.0	57.9	57.9	49.4	34.5	33.6

---

*Initial year funds

**Renewal year funds

TABLE 7.1--Continued

Administrative Problems	Public Univ.	Private Univ.	Public Four-Year	Private Four-Year	Public Two-Year	Private Two-Year
5. Keeping required information	(115)	(52)	(262)	(659)	(395)	(121)
A major problem	21.7%	15.4%	13.4%	11.9%	16.7%	13.2%
A minor problem	46.1	42.3	46.2	43.6	50.9	38.8
No problem	32.2	42.3	40.5	44.5	32.4	47.9
6. Keeping race/ethnic data	(116)	(53)	(262)	(657)	(398)	(118)
A major problem	46.6%	43.4%	27.5%	22.4%	23.6%	13.6%
A minor problem	31.9	45.3	43.1	42.9	45.5	39.8
No problem	21.6	11.3	29.4	34.7	30.9	46.6
7. Problem Index (number of problems reported)*	(117)	(53)	(262)	(662)	(398)	(122)
None	35.9%	32.1%	45.8%	37.5%	38.2%	38.5%
One	31.6	32.1	30.5	29.8	27.9	34.4
Two	20.5	15.1	18.7	21.0	19.6	18.0
Three or more	12.0	20.8	5.0	11.8	14.3	9.0

*Since almost all aid administrators stated that the timing of the funding notification was a problem, this item is excluded from the index.

new type of student about whose behavior patterns little is as yet known. Financial aid and admissions personnel can only estimate--with little or no experimental data--the extent to which those admitted will actually appear on campus at the start of the semester.

Keeping informed about program changes appears to be somewhat more of a problem for two-year (smaller) schools. Perhaps this is because the smaller schools tend to communicate less with Washington, with their regional office, and with aid administrators at other institutions. Greater effort should be made at the regional level to ensure that contact is maintained with the smaller schools.

Keeping the required information does not seem to constitute a serious problem for many schools; it appears rather to be a minor problem for most. Gathering the race and ethnic data required for Fiscal-Operations Reports is a major problem at the university level, a minor problem at all levels. Only the two-year private school indicates that this is no problem. Further analysis reveals that the problem of gathering race and ethnic data is inversely related to the proportion of minority enrollment (see Table A.7.2).

The number of problems reported by each school was totaled to construct a Problems Index. The last item in Table 7.1 indicates that the private university is least likely to report no problems, most likely to report three or more problems. On the other hand, the four-year public institution is most likely to report no problems, least likely to report three or more.

One would almost automatically assume that the larger an EOG program at an institution, the more likely the existence of problems. This is not the case, however: while the variations are slight, it appears that large-program schools most frequently report no problems, while small-program schools have the highest proportion reporting three or more problems (Table 7.2).

If the actual number of EOG's in a school is not directly related to the number of problems, we might expect the proportion of EOG's, or of students receiving financial aid, to be a crucial determinant of problems encountered in administering the program. There is a relationship but it is an inverse one: the higher the proportion of undergraduates receiving either EOG's or financial aid in a student body, the fewer the problems reported! In other words, both the absolute and the relative size of an institution's financial aid program are inversely related to the number of problems reported. The site visits confirm this finding: aid administrators at small-program schools are struggling to meet the commitments of multiple roles. They find it difficult to understand and implement Branch directives; the completion of reporting and application forms looms as a problem; their preference for "student contact" makes them chafe under the fiscal requirements of their positions.[1]

In Chapter One, an example of one unanticipated consequence of federal financial aid programs was cited. Aid officers at small-program

---

[1] See Chapter Six for a more extensive discussion of size as a crucial aspect of the context within which financial aid programs operate.

TABLE 7.2

NUMBER OF PROBLEMS REPORTED BY SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Institutional Characteristics	Number of Problems				
	None	One	Two	Three or More	(n)
(1) Size of EOG program					
Small (under 100)	36.7	29.9	20.7	12.8	(1,011)
Medium (100-299)	40.7	29.9	20.7	8.6	(405)
Large (300+)	45.5	30.8	13.6	10.1	(198)
(2) Percentage of EOG's of all undergraduates					
Less than 1%	31.5	30.1	26.0	12.3	(73)
26% or more	52.9	23.5	14.7	8.8	(69)
(3) Percentage of all undergraduates receiving financial aid					
Less than 25%	37.5	29.6	19.1	13.8	(527)
60% or more	46.7	30.2	15.8	7.2	(291)
(4) Racial composition					
Predominantly white	37.9	30.2	20.3	11.7	(1,542)
Predominantly black	58.3	26.4	9.7	5.6	(72)
(5) Number of recruitment channels used					
None	35.1	33.0	22.6	9.3	(464)
Three or more	41.3	25.6	19.8	13.2	(363)

institutions have called upon their more experienced colleagues for informal assistance in completing reports, preparing applications for funds, handling fiscal-operations. An informal network of "moonlighters" has arisen to meet the needs of these small-program schools.

These traveling professionals are, in effect, performing essential training functions. Regional personnal are attempting to offer assistance to institutions in the form of periodic workshops, visitations, or bulletins. However, some regional offices have been unable to meet the needs of the small institutions--which constitute more than three-fifths of all participating schools.[2]

Ideally, every institution planning to enter a program should be given a small developmental grant to get the program administratively operational before providing financial aid to students. Since most schools are already participating in the program it is too late to implement this recommendation; it should be kept in mind, however, when different types of schools become eligible for participation in the EOG program.[3]

---

[2] The tremendous burden on the regional offices was underscored during the week of panel review meetings. The project director noted that during a four-hour session at which the applications of approximately twenty small institutions were reviewed, a conscientious Senior Program Officer earmarked all but two or three for what he called "technical assistance." He noted that he couldn't possibly get to all of them but that they all obviously needed direction.

[3] Late entry into the program, more typical of the smaller than the larger institutions, is itself slightly related to problems reported. Forty per cent of the schools which entered the program in 1966, compared to 35 per cent of those entering after that, report no problems.

That the private university, which was found to be the most active recruiter of disadvantaged students, also reports more problems than the other types, suggests that problems may be an accompaniment to active implementation of program goals. There is no clear-cut evidence that this is so, however, as the final section of Table 7.2 indicates. The schools actively engaged in recruitment are more likely to report no problems than the less active recruiters, but they are also more likely to report three or more problems. In other words, on the whole, active implementation of program goals is not related to the number of administrative problems reported.

When the size of the EOG program is introduced as a control (Table 7.3) a slightly stronger positive relationship between problem-reporting and recruitment activity emerges: for schools with small, medium, or large programs, the higher the school's position on the recruitment index, the more likely are three or more problems to be reported. Conversely, holding recruitment activity constant, small-program schools are more likely than large-program ones to report three or more problems.

About half of the institutions reported that they had established a special program for the recruitment of disadvantaged students (see Chapter Four). We divided institutions with such programs into two categories:

(1) Those in which the program was a separate entity within the institution with an administrator whose sole responsibility was directing the program; these schools are called "innovators."

TABLE 7.3

PERCENT REPORTING THREE OR MORE PROBLEMS BY POSITION ON RECRUITMENT INDEX AND BY SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Institutional Characteristics	Recruitment Index Zero	 One	 Two	 Three or more
Size of Program				
Small	11.8% (348)	12.9% (295)	12.3% (194)	15.2% (171)
Medium	2.2 (92)	8.9 (101)	11.6 (95)	11.1 (117)
Large	- (24)	9.6 (52)	12.8 (47)	12.0 (75)
Institutional Type				
University	5.0% (20)	22.9% (35)	14.3% (42)	13.7% (73)
Four-year	6.5 (248)	10.2 (264)	11.9 (193)	11.4 (219)
Two-year	13.3 (196)	11.4 (149)	11.8 (102)	18.3 (71)
Administration of Recruitment Program				
Innovators	8.1% (37)	6.0% (67)	7.9% (76)	8.3% (121)
Straddlers	4.2 (71)	12.4 (89)	16.5 (115)	16.6 (157)
Make-shifters	10.3 (348)	12.7 (284)	10.9 (137)	14.5 (76)

(2) Those in which the program is directed by an individual who occupies an already established niche within the institution and who plays the dual role of program administrator and financial aid officer, dean of students, registrar, etc.; these are called "straddlers."

Those institutions which may recruit disadvantaged students to various degrees but have established no separate structure within the organization for this purpose form the third category. The schools within this group are called "make-shifters." It can be seen in Table 7.3 that the relationship between recruitment activity and problem-reporting differs among schools with different administrative styles.

Increased recruitment activity is accompanied by a higher rate of problem-reporting--slightly for make-shifters, substantially for straddlers (with divided responsibility), but not at all for innovators. This suggests that it is not so much whether a school has established a special recruitment program, or whether few or many channels are utilized in order to recruit disadvantaged students which determines the problems encountered in administering the EOG program. Problems seem rather to be related to different administrative styles through which program goals are being reached. This question will be explored further in Section III.

That the number of problems reported by financial aid officers differs from one type of institution to another is hardly a significant finding, unless it is also demonstrated that the reporting of problems is itself related to the "success"of the program. In other words, does it matter whether the financial aid officer reports no problems or three problems? Is there a relationship between the number of problems reported and the extent to which the institution sees the EOG program as successful? Table 7.4 explores these questions.

TABLE 7.4

PERCEIVED EFFECTS OF THE EOG PROGRAM
BY NUMBER OF PROBLEMS REPORTED

Perceived Program Effects	Number of Problems Reported Zero	One	Two	Three or More
(1) Percentage reporting program definitely successful	85.8% (625)	79.3% (482)	77.4% (318)	69.9% (183)
(2) Percentage reporting:				
No negative effects	62.0	53.6	47.0	41.4
Two negative effects	9.7	16.0	20.5	20.4
	(608)	(468)	(317)	(181)
(3) Percentage reporting program has had little impact	29.2 (590)	33.6 (446)	32.7 (297)	35.5 (172)
(4) Percentage reporting increase in minority enrollment	86.8 (626)	87.7 (484)	84.4 (320)	80.8 (184)
(5) Percentage reporting:				
No positive effects	22.8	22.8	26.5	21.5
Two positive effects	40.1	36.5	35.0	39.2
	(614)	(474)	(317)	(181)

Compared to schools reporting no problems, institutions reporting three or more problems are:

(1) less likely to assert that the program has been a definite success;

(2) more likely to report that the program has had "negative" effects[4] for them;

(3) more likely to claim that EOG has had little impact at their institution, aside from providing additional funds for financial aid;

(4) less likely to report an increase in minority enrollment

(5) equally likely to discern the positive effects of the program.

In sum, the number of problems reported is:

(1) inversely related to perceived success;

(2) inversely related to recruitment activity; but

(3) unrelated to the number of positive effects perceived as stemming from the program.

---

[4] A negative effects index was contructed by combining the responses of those who stated that EOG has made students less willing to take loans and has fostered unrealistic expectations among students about the availability of financial aid. The positive effects index combines assertions that EOG has brought in a new type of student and has made institutions more willing to take a chance on high risk students. Institutions were distributed on these indices as follows:

Number of Effects	Positive Effects	Negative Effects
None	23.4	54.1
One	38.7	30.9
Two	37.9	15.0
Number of schools	(1,614)	(1,614)

It may be that those financial aid officers who tend to report problems in administering the program are the type who would tend to see the program as less successful. Problem-reporting and perception of success, in other words, may be more a function of the personality of the administrator than of objective indicators of program implementation. The perception of program success reported by financial aid personnel, therefore, is probably less crucial than the kinds of problems reported by different types of institutions as seen in Table 7.1

Section II. Perceived "Success"

Still, the extent to which administrators responsible for the implementation of a program see the program as successful is hardly a variable to be ignored. If we examine the correlates of "perceived success"[5] we find three distinct trends (Table 7.5).

A. Program Activity

Perceived success is directly related to active implementation of the program; that is, those who perceive the program as definitely successful are more likely than others to:

(1) have a recruitment program;

(2) rank high on the Recruitment Index;

(3) Report an increase in minority enrollment;

---

[5] Institutions were asked: "Would you say that the EOG program at your institution has been successful . . . ?" Options were: definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, definitely no. It should be noted that the response to this question is the subjective opinion of the individual completing the institutional questionnaire--usually a financial aid officer.

TABLE 7.5

SELECTED STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS BY PERCEIVED SUCCESS OF EOG PROGRAM

	Perceived Success of EOG*	
	Definitely Successful	Probably or not Successful
A. Selected Institutional Characteristics		
(1) Have special recruitment program	48.4% (1,283)	38.9% (314)
(2) Recruitment Index:		
Zero	26.8% (1,295)	37.3% (316)
Three or more	24.2 (1,295)	15.8 (316)
(3) Increase in minority enrollment	87.1% (1,254)	80.9% (304)
(4) Has some contact with:		
Regional Office	77.3% (1,283)	69.9% (312)
EOG branch	15.9 (1,279)	10.6 (312)
(5) Mean percent receiving financial aid	39.8% (1,266)	32.6% (306)
B. Selected student respondent characteristics		
(1) Minority students	34.0% (7,833)	22.8% (1,491)
(2) Income under $3000	26.4% (7,879)	22.7% (1,508)
(3) Would have been unable to attend college without aid	40.6% (6,894)	36.8% (1,363)
(4) Availability of financial aid most important in decision to attend college	39.1% (6,465)	32.8% (1,298)

*See Table A7.3 for data on distribution of schools on this variable by institutional type and control, by racial composition, by school quality, and by program size.

TABLE 7.5--Continued

	Perceived Success of EOG	
	Definitely Successful	Probably or not Successful
C. Perceived impact of EOG		
(1) Brought in new type (low-income) student	64.8% (1,260)	46.0% (298)
(2) Impetus for recruitment efforts	76.3% (1,252)	59.7% (303)
(3) Made us more willing to take chance on "high risk" students	58.4% (1,253)	44.4% (302)
(4) Little impact besides money	25.6% (1,215)	57.2% (292)
(5) Fostered unrealistic expectations among students	28.7% (1,243)	46.7% (300)
(6) Made students less willing to work or take loan	27.8% (1,257)	37.9% (301)

(4) report more frequent communication with the Washington or Regional Offices;

(5) have a higher percentage of students receiving financial aid.

B. Student Characteristics

Perceived success is directly related to the enrollment in the program of higher proportions of target students; that is, compared to other institutions, schools which perceive the program as definitely successful have more:

(1) minority students;

(2) students from families with incomes under $3000;

(3) students who report they would have been unable to attend college without financial aid;

(4) students who say that the availability of financial aid was most important in decision to attend the school.[6]

C. Program Effects

Perceived success is directly related to the reporting of "positive," and inversely related to the reporting of "negative" effects of the program. That is, compared with other institutions, financial aid officers who perceive the program as definitely successful are more likely to say that EOG has:

(1) brought a new type of student (low-income) to the school;

(2) served as an impetus for recruitment efforts;

(3) made them more willing to take a chance on "high risk" students.

On the other hand, they are less likely to say that EOG has:

(4) had little impact other than providing additional funds;

(5) fostered unrealistic expectations among students regarding the amount of aid available;

(6) made students less willing to work or take a loan.

In other words, the perceived success of the program and various indicators of the impact of the EOG program are all interrelated. In turn perceived success is related to concrete evidence of active implementation of the program. The aid officers who see the program as a success are more likely to report that they are striving to recruit disadvantaged students, less likely to report negative effects, and more likely to be awarding EOG's to a higher proportion of students of exceptional financial need.[7]

---

[6] It should be noted that data are based on student respondents. This means that schools reporting high success have larger proportions of low-income, minority (etc.) student respondents, not necessarily higher proportions of such students in general.

Since the data have been collected at one point in time, documentation of the direction of the relationships uncovered in this section is not feasible. Perceived success may stem directly from active recruitment efforts or from recognition of increased minority enrollments. On the other hand, the schools reporting success may have traditionally had higher proportions of such students. That this may be the case is suggested in Table A.7.3 which shows that aid officers at 80 per cent of the predominantly white, but at 92 per cent of the predominantly black institutions, report that the program has definitely been successful.

Section III. Administrative Styles and Program Success

In Section I of this chapter it was noted that although most schools engage in some recruitment activity, about 300 institutions have established separate programs with special administrators for this purpose. About 400 institutions have set up special programs under the aegis of an administrator already involved in some aspect of admitting students to college, while the remaining schools have not established any special administrative entity for their (modest) recruitment activities. Table 7.3 shows that these differences in administrative style have some bearing on the occurrence of problems in the administration of the EOG program. It is possible, therefore, that these differences in style have consequences for the success of the EOG program. This question is explored in the following section.

---

[7] See Table \A7.1 for further documentation of these relationships.

Table 7.6 examines some characteristics which help predict which administrative style an institution is likely to adopt. It is immediately apparent that size of the EOG program is a crucial determinant of administrative style. Only 13 per cent of the small-, compared to 42 per cent of the large-program schools, have established separately administered programs for recruitment of disadvantaged students. The medium-program school is somewhat more likely than the others to have their recruitment program jointly administered, while the small-program school is unlikely to have established any program for disadvantaged students.[8]

Since large-program schools entered the EOG program earlier, it is not surprising that early entrants are almost twice as likely as later ones to have separately administered programs. Nor is it surprising that the public sector regardless of institutional type leads the private in the establishment of separately administered programs for recruiting disadvantaged students. It is to the public institution that the low-income/minority student tends to find his way and actions are being taken to accommodate his needs. Furthermore, there is a tendency in the public sector with its larger enrollments for each bureaucratic function to be housed in its own organizational nook with an administrative officer and staff. In the private sector, special programs that have been established are more likely to be an appended responsibility of the financial aid director, registrar, or other college official.

---

[8] The absence of a special program is not an indicator of abdication from recruitment efforts. Almost all institutions engage in some activity for this purpose; we are distinguishing between administrative styles rather than institutional efforts.

TABLE 7.6

ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE FOR RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES BY SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Institutional Characteristics	Separately Administered Program (Innovators)	Program Jointly Administered (Straddlers)	No Formal Program (Make-Shifters)	(n)
All schools	19.0%	27.4%	53.6%	(1,585)
Program Size				
Small	13.1%	25.3%	61.7%	(994)
Medium	22.9	32.9	44.2	(398)
Large	41.5	26.9	31.6	(193)
Year Program Started				
1966-67	22.2%	28.5%	49.4%	(1,092)
1967-68 or later	12.6	24.0	63.4	(454)
Type and Control				
Private university	32.7%	48.1%	19.2%	(52)
Public university	46.6	20.7	32.8	(116)
Private four-year	12.9	30.6	56.5	(653)
Public four-year	28.1	24.9	47.0	(253)
Private two-year	11.7	17.5	70.8	(120)
Public two-year	15.6	25.8	58.6	(391)
Racial Composition				
Predominantly white	18.6%	27.6%	53.8%	(1,516)
Predominantly black	27.5	21.7	50.7	(69)

TABLE 7.6--Continued

Institutional Characteristics	Separately Administered Program (Innovators)	Program Jointly Administered (Straddlers)	No Formal Program (Make-Shifters)	(n)
Federal Region				
1	15.1%	33.1%	51.8%	(139)
2	26.2	38.3	35.5	(141)
3	14.8	35.8	49.4	(176)
4	15.5	24.0	60.5	(271)
5	18.3	27.8	53.9	(284)
6	15.7	17.9	66.4	(140)
7	13.8	17.9	68.3	(145)
8	19.7	11.3	69.0	(71)
9	34.7	35.4	29.9	(147)
10	22.5	22.5	54.9	(71)
Increase in Minority Enrollment				
Yes	21.2%	30.7%	48.1%	(1,307)
No	7.2	11.3	81.4	(221)
Community Pressure				
Yes	30.2%	37.0%	32.8%	(427)
No	14.8	23.6	61.6	(1,112)
School Quality				
High	25.9	34.4	39.7	(375)
Medium	17.2	29.5	53.3	(471)
Low	15.6	22.3	62.1	(647)

Regions Two and Nine stand out as those in which separately administered programs abound and in which the absence of a special program is minimal. Similarly, it is these regions which have experienced the largest increase in minority enrollment and which report that community pressure is being exerted to enroll even greater proportions of these students. As Table 7.6 indicates, an increase in minority enrollment as well as community pressure on the institution, are both highly related to (1) whether a program for disadvantaged students is established; and (2) whether the program is separately administered.[9]

More interesting, perhaps, than the question of what factors predict which administrative style an institution adopts in its efforts to enroll disadvantaged students is the question of the "effects" of different administrative styles. Table 7.7 explores this.

It is clear that schools which have established separately administered programs for recruiting disadvantaged students differ from other institutions. They are more likely to:

(1) Rank high on the recruitment index;

(2) Modify admissions criteria for EOG students more frequently than for all undergraduates;

(3) Enroll fewer EOG students from the top quartile of their high school class than all undergraduates;

(4) Have more EOG students using supportive services than all undergraduates.

More significant perhaps is the fact that both inter- and intra-institutional communication is more frequent in schools which have administratively separate programs, as is communication with the Washington and Regional offices. Similarly, among innovators the various federal aid programs appear to complement one another: where

---

[9] The relationship between administrative style and community pressure is not a direct causal one but stems from the fact that the larger schools, universities in particular, more often report community pressure and more frequently establish separate recruitment programs.

TABLE 7.7

SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS BY ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE

	Administrative Style		
Selected Institutional Characteristics	Separately Administered Program (Innovators)	Program Jointly Administered (Straddlers)	No Formal Program (Make-Shifters)
Recruitment Index	(301)	(433)	(848)
Zero	12.3%	16.4%	41.4%
Three or more	40.2	36.5	9.0
Mean percent for whom admissions criteria modified			
All students	6.7% (206)	6.6% (277)	7.2% (427)
EOG students	24.3 (189)	22.0 (262)	15.7 (369)
Mean percent in top high school quartile			
All students	41.5% (251)	40.9% (363)	31.3% (733)
EOG students	36.8 (218)	41.9 (314)	37.8 (626)
Mean percent using supportive services			
All students	13.5% (251)	13.2% (352)	14.8% (644)
EOG students	29.8 (247)	27.6 (354)	21.6 (605)
Percent using CWS funds for student tutors	62.2% (259)	56.8% (366)	43.0% (586)
Regularly communicate with:			
EOG Branch	24.1% (299)	14.6% (424)	11.0% (839)
DSFA	21.6 (296)	14.9 (424)	11.7 (836)
Regional Office	81.1 (297)	80.1 (427)	71.7 (842)
Frequently communicate with:			
FAOs at other colleges	24.0% (300)	20.4% (431)	16.2% (847)
Other administrators at own institution	58.4 (298)	53.2 (427)	51.7 (843)

students are used as tutors they are paid with College Work-Study money most frequently by these schools, least frequently by schools with no special program. The "straddlers" (with a special program jointly administered) are in between.

Table 7.8 examines the relationship between administrative styles and selected indicators of "perceived success" of the EOG program, holding constant the size of the EOG program.

The data in Table 7.8 suggest that the relationship between "perceived success" and administrative style varies with the size of the financial aid program. In institutions with small EOG programs (under 100) what seems to count is whether there is a special program, while in medium- and large-program institutions, the perceived success of the EOG program rests more on the type of special program for disadvantaged students, rather than on its presence or absence.

In institutions with large EOG programs perceived success is highest and problem-reporting lowest among innovators, while problem-reporting is highest among the make-shifters in large-program institutions. In other words, aid officers who administer large financial aid programs appear to feel that they are most successful when their activities are administratively separate from, but functionally coordinated with, a special program for disadvantaged students. The already overburdened financial aid officer is likely to report more problems and see EOG as less successful in those large-program schools where there are no clear-cut administrative distinctions between the financial aid operation and recruitment-retention activities.

TABLE 7.8

"PERCEIVED SUCCESS" OF EOG PROGRAM BY ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE AND BY SIZE OF EOG PROGRAM

	Administrative Style		
"Perceived Success"	Innovators	Straddlers	Make-Shifters
Percent reporting program definitely successful			
Small	78.5% (130)	81.5% (249)	75.4% (610)
Medium	85.7 (91)	89.3 (131)	80.7 (176)
Large	87.5 (80)	82.7 (52)	86.7 (60)
Percent reporting two positive effects			
Small	43.4% (129)	42.3% (246)	30.8% (600)
Medium	40.0 (90)	53.8 (130)	35.3 (173)
Large	49.4 (79)	39.2 (51)	37.3 (59)
Percent reporting no negative effects			
Small	53.1% (128)	60.2% (244)	56.3% (597)
Medium	55.1 (89)	52.7 (129)	45.9 (172)
Large	47.5 (80)	58.8 (51)	47.5 (59)
Percent reporting two or more problems			
Small	28.5% (130)	32.8% (250)	34.3% (609)
Medium	34.1 (91)	32.8 (131)	24.4 (176)
Large	21.3 (80)	21.1 (52)	29.5 (61)

Interestingly, in medium-program schools (100-299 EOG's) the EOG program is perceived as most successful and more positive effects are reported among the "straddlers." In other words, in these institutions, a special program for disadvantaged students may be functional as long as such a program is under the aegis of the financial aid officer or other traditional organizational administrator.

Just as "perceived success" of the EOG program appears to be a function of both size of the program and administrative style, so too are more objective measures of program success. If schools are actively recruiting EOG students who cannot meet the usual admissions criteria and who require supportive services then the more successful the program, the more EOG students (compared to all undergraduates) should have been admitted under special provisions and should be receiving supportive services.

Using this as an indicator of program success, make-shifters administering any sized EOG program are the least successful. Among large-program schools the innovators are the most successful, while among medium-program institutions, straddlers appear to be slightly more successful than the others.

The data in Table 7.9, in other words, appear to corroborate those in Table 7.8: both subjective and objective measures of program success are differentially related to administrative style--depending upon the size of the EOG program.

A more intensive analysis of the consequences of different administrative styles for the success of the EOG program is beyond the

TABLE 7.9

SELECTED INDICATORS OF "SUCCESS" BY ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE AND BY SIZE OF EOG PROGRAM

	Administrative Style		
"Success" Indicators	Innovators	Straddlers	Make-Shifters
Mean percent for whom admissions criteria are modified:			
Small			
All students	6.6% (81)	7.4% (143)	7.4% (286)
EOG students	27.0 (74)	24.9 (132)	18.0 (247)
Medium			
All students	7.1% (71)	6.2% (96)	7.0 (109)
EOG students	21.7 (63)	21.3 (95)	10.8 (100)
Large			
All students	6.4% (54)	4.7% (38)	7.0% (32)
EOG students	23.5 (52)	13.3 (35)	12.4 (22)
Mean percent receiving supportive services:			
Small			
All students	15.2% (112)	15.4% (209)	16.0% (464)
EOG students	32.1 (108)	30.6 (204)	24.0 (427)
Medium			
All students	12.0% (73)	11.3% (104)	12.0% (132)
EOG students	25.4 (71)	24.3 (108)	16.8 (131)
Large			
All students	12.4% (66)	11.6% (39)	10.6% (48)
EOG students	30.8 (68)	21.2 (42)	12.6 (47)

scope of this report. The data in Table 7.8, however, suggest that the establishment of special programs for recruitment and retention of disadvantaged students is not in and of itself an indicator of program "success." Some institutions appear to engage in recruitment activities "successfully" without establishing special programs for this purpose; in other institutions such programs are more "successful" when they are administratively distinct from the financial aid operation. Apparently the size of an institution's financial aid program is a relevant factor in determining the "success" of different administrative styles.

Section IV. Funding

Perceived and objective indicators of program success notwithstanding, the crucial measure of the success of a federal financial aid program is the extent to which funds are adequate to provide financial aid to eligible applicants. Appropriate administrative styles may facilitate effective utilization of funds. Perceived success may mitigate the frustrations encountered by financial aid officers in administering the program. An inadequate allocation, however, cannot be stretched to meet the requirements of needy applicants.

In Chapter Five we noted that states receive varying proportions of the amounts recommended by the panels. It was found that the lower the percentage actually received, the more frequent the complaint of financial aid officers that funds were inadequate to meet the needs of all eligible applicants (see Table 5.2).

The data presented in Table 7.10 point clearly to the fact that funding is least adequate where the need is the greatest. White institutions are more favored than black ones. Public two-year schools, in which low-income students are overrepresented, are least frequently located in states which are funded at 80 per cent or more. Institutions in counties which have 50 per cent or more of the population subsisting on incomes of less than $3000, receive substantially less favorable funding than those in the wealthier counties. Finally, funding is less favorable for institutions in which higher proportions of all undergraduates receive financial aid. The Congressional mandate to channel funds to students with the greatest need is being executed at the institutional level but is being thwarted at the national level in the allocation of funds!

Institutions are directed to make realistic, well-documented estimates of the monies they will be required to meet the needs of eligible applicants. They recognize, however, that even if the panel approves their application, the amount requested will not be forthcoming. They recognize, further, that inadequate state funding means inadequate institutional funding which, in turn, means unfulfilled, as well as uncertain commitments, and stretching the allocation which means that the student has an assessed need in excess of the aid awarded.

Throughout, this report has documented the fact that institutions are allocating EOG's to students of exceptional financial need. They are, in most cases, making concerted efforts to recruit, admit, and retain such students with varying degrees of success. The most

TABLE 7.10

PERCENTAGE OF PANEL APPROVED AMOUNT STATE RECEIVED BY SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Institutional Characteristics	80% or More	70% or Less	(N)
Racial composition			
Predominantly white	34.2%	21.2%	(1,843)
Predominantly black	25.0	32.3	(96)
Type-control			
Private university	40.3%	23.9%	(67)
Public university	39.7	21.4	(131)
Private four-year	39.2	20.9	(814)
Public four-year	33.7	23.3	(305)
Private two-year	34.8	17.4	(155)
Public two-year	21.2	23.3	(467)
Percent in county with income under $3000			
Less than 10%	41.9%	24.2%	(124)
50% or more	17.0	40.0	(100)
Mean percent aided by institution	37.9% (547)	42.1% (328)	
Year program started			
1966-67	37.3%	20.4%	(1,110)
1969-70	26.0	22.1	(131)

constant refrain, with only a few exceptions, however, has been "inadequate funding": insufficient funds for recruitment, for financial aid, for supportive services.

The data presented in the last table confirm the need to allocate more funds--especially to institutions in which exceptionally low income students are overrepresented. Financial aid personnel are doing their utmost to fulfill program objectives with the scarce resources at their disposal. Increasing these resources will go a long way toward maximizing program goals and toward making the benefits of education beyond high school available to all who wish to take advantage of this opportunity regardless of family origin.

APPENDIX A

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE A2.1

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT NON-RESPONDENTS BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics	Percentage Not Responding	(n)
(1) Race		
Black	33%	(2,354)
Indian, Oriental, Spanish	26	(683)
White	15	(6,484)
(2) Sex		
Male	24%	(4,575)
Female	17	(4,946)
(3) High School Quartile Placement		
Bottom Quartile	37%	(323)
Third Quartile	27	(807)
Second Quartile	21	(1,823)
Top Quartile	15	(3,983)
(4) Family Income		
Under $3000	23	(2,485)
$3000-4499	20	(2,175)
$4500-5999	20	(2,145)
$6000-7499	17	(1,591)
$7500 or more	17	(1,285)

TABLE A3.1

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF EOG STUDENTS BY FAMILY INCOME AND BY RACE

Selected Characteristics	Family Income Under $3000	 $3000-5999	 $6000-7499	 $7500-8999	 $9000 or more
1. Demographic					
a. Permanent residents in South or Border states					
Black	66 (749)	61 (993)	45 (273)	32 (92)	24 (62)
White	38 (1,315)	32 (2,730)	26 (1,094)	23 (595)	20 (380)
b. Grew up on farm or in small town					
Black	45 (522)	35 (689)	26 (180)	23 (60)	31 (45)
White	61 (1,099)	57 (2,368)	53 (974)	46 (525)	40 (336)
c. Grew up in large city					
Black	23 (522)	29 (689)	32 (180)	50 (60)	33 (45)
White	11 (1,099)	10 (2,368)	11 (974)	10 (525)	12 (336)
d. First in family to attend attend college					
Black	49 (393)	43 (483)	28 (127)	29 (42)	36 (33)
White	40 (775)	33 (1,577)	28 (579)	26 (300)	20 (193)
e. Father had eight years or less schooling					
Black	53 (489)	41 (659)	34 (178)	28 (60)	33 (45)
White	40 (1,077)	29 (2,331)	22 (969)	15 (527)	15 (336)

TABLE A3.1--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Family Income Under $3000	 $3000-5999	 $6000-7499	 $7500-8999	 $9000 or more
1. Demographic (cont'd)					
f. Mother had eight years or less schooling					
Black	37 (510)	22 (680)	12 (179)	7 (61)	11 (45)
White	26 (1,090)	17 (2,358)	12 (975)	10 (527)	7 (333)
g. Family head an unskilled worker, or unemployed					
Black	59 (476)	41 (648)	28 (177)	22 (58)	32 (44)
White	29 (1,070)	23 (2,316)	16 (954)	12 (518)	9 (331)
2. Academic					
a. Ranked in bottom half of high school class					
Black	25 (468)	26 (684)	26 (201)	26 (69)	33 (48)
White	15 (960)	13 (2,186)	12 (902)	8 (498)	11 (321)
b. Enrolled in non-college preparatory program					
Black	55 (502)	47 (678)	40 (179)	40 (60)	30 (44)
White	41 (1,088)	37 (2,339)	30 (968)	25 (524)	21 (331)
c. Less than half of high school class went to college					
Black	64 (517)	62 (686)	62 (179)	64 (59)	57 (44)
White	57 (1,096)	53 (2,361)	52 (969)	49 (525)	46 (335)

TABLE A3.1--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Family Income				
	Under $3000	$3000-5999	$6000-7499	$7500-8999	$9000 or more
2. Academic (cont'd)					
d. Mean SAT-V					
Black	358 (276)	371 (447)	383 (122)	418 (35)	423 (33)
White	492 (428)	502 (1,128)	517 (524)	520 (304)	526 (201)
e. Mean ACT					
Black	14 (195)	15 (221)	17 (73)	14 (24)	28 (14)
White	25 (465)	26 (1,001)	26 (343)	26 (174)	28 (122)
f. Admitted as "high risk"					
Black	26 (701)	27 (962)	32 (271)	29 (93)	36 (61)
White	7 (1,252)	4 (2,657)	4 (1,078)	2 (595)	2 (371)
g. Receive supportive service					
Black	35 (770)	34 (1,022)	42 (282)	34 (101)	44 (64)
White	12 (1,349)	9 (2,815)	8 (1,127)	6 (622)	4 (391)
h. Mean college GPA					
Black	2.19 (583)	2.17 (730)	2.23 (216)	2.29 (80)	2.41 (43)
White	2.54 (1,098)	2.57 (2,230)	2.62 (914)	2.64 (524)	2.68 (350)
3. Financial					
a. Most important factor in choosing college was low cost or financial aid					
Black	13 (455)	9 (630)	12 (162)	2 (52)	2 (40)
White	14 (1,041)	12 (2,231)	11 (922)	10 (494)	11 (322)

TABLE A3.1--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Family Income				
	Under $3000	$3000-5999	$6000-7499	$7500-8999	$9000 or more
3. Financial (cont'd)					
b. Most important factor in choosing college was academic program					
Black	13 (455)	22 (630)	18 (162)	23 (52)	25 (40)
White	24 (1,041)	28 (2,231)	31 (922)	30 (494)	30 (322)
c. Would have been unable to attend college without financial aid					
Black	57 (520)	52 (687)	38 (177)	33 (58)	51 (45)
White	45 (1,092)	36 (2,343)	30 (972)	27 (521)	28 (333)
d. Found out eligible for financial aid after graduating from high school					
Black	41 (518)	32 (688)	29 (177)	42 (59)	22 (45)
White	33 (1,092)	24 (2,346)	21 (977)	19 (524)	18 (334)
e. Parents pay none of college expenses					
Black	49 (504)	43 (681)	31 (177)	32 (60)	44 (45)
White	62 (1,093)	47 (2,346)	42 (968)	40 (519)	42 (337)
f. Mean EOG					
Black	$589 (766)	$582 (1,017)	$600 (282)	$578 (100)	$596 (64)
White	$581 (1,347)	$570 (2,807)	$529 (1,127)	$475 (622)	$457 (389)

TABLE A3.1--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Family Income Under $3000	 $3000-5999	 $6000-7499	 $7500-8999	 $9000 or more
3. Financial (cont'd)					
g. Mean total financial aid					
Black	$1201 (501)	$1266 (667)	$1396 (169)	$1511 (58)	$1567 (45)
White	$1227(1,071)	$1209(2,301)	$1196 (955)	$1132 (503)	$1191 (325)
4. Attitudinal					
a. Borrowing to pay for college should be a last resort					
Black	40 (496)	53 (657)	55 (174)	59 (58)	61 (44)
White	49 (1,084)	49 (2,331)	52 (975)	51 (522)	56 (328)
b. Most important purpose of college is to develop job or career skills					
Black	60 (487)	60 (658)	60 (172)	63 (54)	56 (41)
White	59 (1,073)	56 (2,322)	54 (961)	51 (519)	47 (332)
c. Very satisfied with college					
Black	33 (515)	34 (693)	28 (183)	25 (60)	36 (44)
White	54 (1,104)	55 (2,371)	53 (981)	50 (528)	47 (336)
d. Expect to go to graduate school					
Black	65 (514)	64 (671)	74 (174)	61 (61)	70 (45)
White	51 (1,080)	52 (2,327)	55 (963)	52 (516)	56 (332)

TABLE A3.1--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Family Income Under $3000	 $3000-5999	 $6000-7499	 $7500-8999	 $9000 or more
4. Attitudinal (cont'd)					
e. Expect to enter a "high prestige" occupation					
Black	18 (491)	20 (638)	29 (160)	25 (56)	24 (42)
White	24 (1,024)	25 (2,160)	25 (896)	26 (476)	23 (308)
f. Expect to earn $10,000 or more					
Black	66 (515)	67 (668)	68 (174)	77 (60)	64 (45)
White	45 (1,052)	45 (2,265)	48 (949)	49 (504)	50 (329)

TABLE A3.2

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF INDEPENDENT AND PARENT-SUPPORTED STUDENTS

Selected Characteristics	Independent	Parent-Supported Students
Black	28.1% (1,049)	24.2% (8.042)
Age: 22 or older	45.5% (1,056)	8.4% (6,778)
Family has received welfare	19.7% (1,038)	15.2% (6,680)
Married, Separated, or Divorced	42.2% (1,059)	4.4% (6,810)
Father not living	22.3% (1,039)	15.3% (6,746)
Mean family income	$3362 (1,141)	$4973 (8,163)

TABLE A3.3

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF EOG STUDENTS BY AGE

Selected Characteristics	21 Years or Younger		22 Years or Older	
(1) Freshmen	36.6%	(8,286)	8.0%	(1,314)
(2) Taking courses more than four years	.1	(8,297)	22.6	(1,315)
(3) Living at home while attending college	23.9	(8,257)	41.6	(1,314)
(4) Decided to go to college after graduating from high school	2.9	(8,264)	25.4	(1,297)
(5) What student would have done if no financial aid:	(8,200)		(1,304)	
Attended part-time	8.9		13.9	
Attended different college	26.4		13.7	
Been unable to go to college	39.2		45.7	
(6) Found out eligible for financial aid when in college	11.2	(8,231)	48.8	(1,288)
(7) Source of info about financial aid was:	(7,826)		(1,240)	
High school person	34.7		14.2	
College person	27.2		51.5	
(8) Expects a graduate or professional degree	47.3	(8,154)	60.7	(1,292)
(9) Male	45.8	(8,339)	50.8	(1,319)
(10) Percentage married, divorced, separated	5.4	(8,330)	38.3	(1,324)

TABLE A3.4

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF EOG STUDENTS BY TYPE OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH STUDENT GREW UP

	Type of Community				
Selected Student Characteristics	Farm, Ranch or Reservation	Small Town	Moderate Size City	Suburb	Large City
1. Living home while attending college	13.4% (1,902)	19.6% (2,743)	28.6% (2,399)	34.5% (930)	44.8% (1,606)
2. Applied to another college	37.2% (1,902)	46.6% (2,756)	53.5% (2,402)	57.5% (928)	62.7% (1,589)
3. Most important source of information about financial aid was:	(1,819)	(2,605)	(2,269)	(886)	(1,590)
High school person	36.9%	34.3%	29.1%	29.7%	27.6%
Parents	18.1	18.5	19.4	16.0	14.3
UB, ETS	2.7	3.3	3.9	2.6	6.4
4. Feels it will be hard to get a job even with education*	12.1% (1,881)	15.5% (2,702)	19.1% (2,355)	23.3% (917)	25.2% (1,574)
5. Very satisfied with college	54.8% (1,909)	51.0% (2,766)	48.7% (2,399)	46.8% (930)	38.6% (1,615)
6. Most important purpose of college is:	(1,855)	(2,679)	(2,324)	(911)	(1,540)
Vocational training	61.1%	58.1%	53.7%	49.4%	52.1%
General education	24.7	27.0	28.7	32.5	27.5
Develop community interests	14.2	15.0	17.6	18.1	20.4

TABLE A3.4--Continued

	Type of Community				
Selected Student Characteristics	Farm, Ranch or Reservation	Small Town	Moderate Size City	Suburb	Large City
7. Male	43.2% (1,915)	45.5% (2,776)	47.0% (2,414)	48.5% (936)	50.9% (1,622)
8. Find students more friendly than expected	40.9% (1,908)	37.3% (2,760)	35.8% (2,400)	32.3% (929)	28.8% (1,611)

*See Table 5.6 for attitudes towards grants, work, and loans.

TABLE A3.5

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF EOG STUDENTS BY SEX

Selected Characteristics	Male Students		Female Students	
(1) Resident student	63.9%	(4,718)	67.8%	(5,056)
(2) Mean SAT (Verbal + Math)	993	(2,031)	938	(2,061)
(3) Ranked in top high school quartile	49.8	(3,443)	64.5	(3,721)
(4) "High risk"	13.0	(4,478)	9.3	(4,866)
(5) Parents were most important in decision to attend college	26.0	(3,982)	31.1	(4,665)
(6) Most important factor in choosing college was:	(4,134)		(4,813)	
Low cost or financial aid	47.2		52.9	
Academic program	27.3		23.0	
Athletic program	5.4		.5	
(7) Would have been unable to attend college at all without financial aid	35.5	(4,443)	44.0	(5,103)
(8) Would have attended a different college if no financial aid	27.2	(4,443)	22.4	(5,103)
(9) Feel that work should be avoided during school year	83.0	(4,347)	79.2	(4,964)
(10) Feel that borrowing to pay for college should be a last resort	53.7	(4,382)	48.3	(5,032)
(11) Very satisfied with college	45.8	(4,487)	51.2	(5,166)
(12) Expect to obtain a graduate or professional degree	54.5	(4,421)	44.5	(5,075)

TABLE A3.5--Continued

Selected Characteristics	Male Students		Female Students	
(13) Occupational plans	(4,397)		(5,081)	
Elementary or high school teaching	19.4		44.9	
"Prestige" occupations*	38.3		11.7	
Nursing or lab technician	1.0		6.8	
Business, etc.	17.2		5.5	
(14) Percentage (with older sibling) who are first to attend college	38.2	(2,995)	33.5	(3,432)
(15) Mean EOG	$567	(4,781)	$558	(5,142)
(16) Mean family income	$4803	(4,494)	$4753	(4,830)
(17) Mean total aid	$1255	(4,312)	$1209	(4,992)

*College teaching, research, law, medicine, dentistry, architecture, engineering.

TABLE A3.6

(a)

PERCENTAGE OF FINANCIAL AID OFFICERS REPORTING STUDENT INCOME UNDER $3000 BY STUDENT'S REPORTED FAMILY INCOME AND BY STUDENT STATUS

Student Reported Family Income	Independent Students		Parent-Supported Students	
Under $3000	72.4%	(195)	64.0%	(1,108)
$3000-5999	38.1	(302)	15.3	(2,598)
$6000 or more	42.0	(331)	5.2	(2,228)
(n)				

(b)

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS REPORTING FAMILY INCOME ABOVE $6000 BY FAO INCOME DATA AND BY STUDENT STATUS

FAO Reported Income	Independent Students		Parent-Supported Students	
Under $3000	37.1%	(375)	9.7%	(1,194)
$3000-5999	35.1	(259)	19.2	(2,602)
$6000 or more	67.7	(96)	77.0	(1,959)

TABLE A3.7*

PERCENTAGE EXPECTING TO EARN $15,000 A YEAR OR MORE BY OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE AND BY RACE

Occupational Choice	Race of Student			
	Black		White	
College teaching or research	32.8%	(128)	14.5%	(546)
Law, medicine, dentistry	55.9	(102)	46.0	(313)
Elementary or high school teaching	10.7	(403)	1.2	(1,884)
Social work, librarian, psychologist	21.6	(278)	6.1	(472)
Architecture, engineering, chemistry	35.7	(56)	18.5	(340)
Business, sales	30.1	(236)	16.5	(497)
Public relations, journalism	28.6	(98)	11.9	(293)

*We present this table to underscore the (unrealistically) high income expectations of the black student. Our attention, however, was called to a recent article which noted that a black Ph.D. can expect to earn $4000 a year more than a white with the same training. Perhaps the blacks' expectations are not so out of line! (*Time*, May 24, 1971, p. 50.)

TABLE A3.8

CHARACTERISTICS OF BLACK AND WHITE EOG STUDENTS IN PREDOMINANTLY BLACK AND WHITE INSTITUTIONS

	Predominantly White Institutions				Predominantly Black Institutions	
	White Students		Black Students		Black Students	
A. Demographic Characteristics						
(1) Percent male	48.9%	(6,464)	51.5%	(1,414)	37.1%	(940)
(2) Age: 22 or older	12.8	(5,464)	12.6	(891)	12.8	(693)
(3) Residence while in high school:						
Farm, ranch, or town	54.9	(5,462)	24.9	(890)	51.2	(898)
Large city	10.6	(5,462)	39.1	(890)	14.5	(898)
(4) Father's education						
Some college or more	23.4	(5,399)	15.0	(848)	10.1	(670)
No high school	27.6	(5,399)	38.6	(848)	50.2)	(670)
(5) Mother's education						
Some college or more	23.4	(5,446)	16.9	(882)	13.7	(686)
No high school	16.7	(5,446)	21.8	(882)	29.1	(686)
(6) Father not head of family while in high school	20.8	(5,411)	42.3	(882)	35.6	(688)
(7) Head of family laborer or unemployed	20.8	(5,373)	42.4	(860)	45.4	(677)
(8) Family has received welfare	11.9	(5,490)	30.1	(873)	21.8	(683)
(9) Mean family income	$5054	(6,175)	$4436	(1,307)	$3639	(854)
B. Academic characteristics						
(1) Not enrolled in college preparatory program in high school	34.9%	(5,413)	45.2%	(880)	52.7%	(675)
(2) Ranked in bottom half of high school class	12.7	(4,979)	29.2	(944)	20.8	(587)
(3) Mean SAT-V	505	(2,657)	406	(499)	331	(468)
(4) Mean ACT	21.9	(1,979)	16.0	(313)	12.9	(226)
(5) More than half high school class went on to college	47.1	(5,477)	42.3	(883)	31.2	(695)
(6) Three closest friends went to college	58.3	(5,369)	55.7	(848)	48.5	(655)

	Predominantly White Institutions				Predominantly Black Institutions	
	White Students		Black Students		Black Students	
(7) 50% or more in high school were black	2.1%	(5,476)	53.9%	(895)	83.5%	(692)
(8) Student was "high risk"	4.3	(6,135)	39.1	(1,309)	11.2	(923)
(9) Mean college GPA	2.58	(5,274)	2.14	(982)	2.26	(769)
(10) Receive supportive service	37.9	(5,443)	65.7	(893)	66.6	(691)
C. Financial Aid						
(1) Parents pay none of college expenses	48.9%	(5,426)	50.6%	(879)	33.8%	(680)
(2) Low cost, or availability of aid most important in college decision	46.4	(5,166)	60.6	(797)	62.6	(621)
(3) Without financial aid would have:						
Been unable to attend college	35.6	(5,422)	46.0	(892)	59.5	(686)
Gone to a different college	25.0	(5,422)	32.1	(892)	17.3	(686)
(4) Mean EOG	$551	(6,475)	$652	(1,436)	$495	(940)
(5) Mean total financial aid	$1190	(5,310)	$1467	(844)	$1015	(682)
(6) Independent student	14.2	(6,408)	20.5	(1,410)	11.5	(934)
(7) Packaging	(6,514)		(1,441)		(949)	
CWS + NDSL	21.1		23.5		24.6	
CWS, no NDSL	18.1		21.4		25.7	
NDSL, no CWS	41.4		35.2		34.2	
EOG only	19.4		19.9		15.5	
State scholarship	19.3		12.6		2.6	
Other scholarship	25.7		27.7		16.0	
(8) Amount of financial aid is sufficient	67.3	(5,363)	59.1	(858)	48.2	(655)

	Predominantly White Institutions				Predominantly Black Institutions	
	White Students		Black Students		Black Students	
D. Attitudinal						
(1) Student agrees with following:						
Grants should be awarded to needy students of high academic promise	36.5%	(5,432)	18.4%	(886)	24.0%	(683)
Borrowing to pay for college should be a last resort	50.4	(5,401)	55.1	(861)	40.1	(654)
Working to pay for college should be avoided	78.7	(5,331)	88.7	(859)	82.4	(647)
Even with education, it will be hard to get a good job	15.2	(5,411)	29.4	(871)	17.2	(668)
(2) Expect graduate or professional degree	46.3	(5,382)	56.2	(877)	59.3	(680)
(3) Expect to enter "prestige" occupation	25.0	(5,376)	19.7	(874)	19.1	(682)
(4) Expect to earn $12,500 or more after 5 years	22.8	(5,257)	41.5	(877)	43.3	(687)
(5) MOST important purpose of college is:	(5,371)		(848)		(651)	
Development of job skills	55.1%		55.9%		64.2%	
Broad general education	30.9		20.0		16.6	
Development of community awareness	14.1		24.1		19.2	
(6) Student feels most students are from families with more money than his	76.2	(5,463)	86.0	(894)	50.8	(687)
(7) Student feels his grades are above average	44.8	(5,481)	17.6	(901)	26.4	(693)
(8) Students are less friendly than expected	8.8	(5,479)	23.1	(899)	10.4	(693)
(9) Student dissatisfied with college	12.5	(5,488)	28.2	(897)	13.4	(694)

TABLE A4.1

MEAN PERCENTAGE OF ALL STUDENTS AND OF EOG STUDENTS WHO ARE MALE BY SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	EOG Students		All Students	
Total	52.1%	(1,359)	58.2%	(1,404)
Type and control				
(1) Private university	62.7	(46)	67.3	(51)
(2) Public university	52.6	(101)	59.3	(100)
(3) Private four-year	56.1	(520)	58.2	(551)
(4) Public four-year	45.0	(242)	53.4	(240)
(5) Private two-year	49.1	(91)	55.6	(97)
(6) Public two-year	50.2	(359)	60.5	(365)
Racial composition				
Predominantly white	52.7	(1,296)	58.8	(1,343)
Predominantly black	38.8	(63)	44.0	(61)
Federal region				
1	57.8	(96)	64.1	(94)
2	55.2	(109)	57.8	(114)
3	57.7	(139)	61.6	(141)
4	47.0	(246)	55.7	(250)
5	53.2	(239)	58.2	(260)
6	46.4	(126)	56.0	(130)
7	51.3	(127)	57.0	(131)
8	53.3	(66)	63.0	(64)
9	53.8	(131)	56.9	(138)
10	48.2	(64)	57.3	(66)
School quality				
High	57.8	(329)	59.9	(348)
Medium	52.6	(387)	56.9	(409)
Low	48.4	(584)	58.2	(618)

TABLE A4.2

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF "HIGH RISK" STUDENTS BY SCHOOL QUALITY

Selected Items	School Quality High	 Medium	 Low
Percentage considered "high risk":			
(1) In bottom half of high school class	39.9%(308)	30.3%(320)	29.6%(405)
(2) Income under $3000	22.4 (530)	9.4 (752)	13.9 (747)
(3) SAT-V under 350	30.3 (198)	26.5 (223)	27.2 (173)
(4) ACT under 15	58.2 (55)	23.5 (166)	25.4 (210)
Percentage of "high risk" students who:			
(1) Receive supportive service	65.9%(217)	61.3%(173)	47.6%(210)
(2) Are somewhat dissatisfied with college	25.0 (216)	20.9 (172)	15.3 (209)
(3) Reported UB or ETS was most important source of information about financial aid	12.6 (199)	7.6 (157)	7.0 (186)

TABLE A4.3

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS REPORTING THAT WITHOUT FINANCIAL AID THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO GO TO COLLEGE OR WOULD HAVE ATTENDED A DIFFERENT COLLEGE BY RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES OF INSTITUTION

Recruitment Activities of Institution	Would Have Attended Different College	Would Have Been Unable to Attend College	(n)
Contact with high schools			
Regular	25.9	40.4	(5,944)
Not at all	21.4	35.4	(271)
Contact with community groups			
Regular	27.2	38.3	(3,552)
Not at all	19.7	44.1	(483)
Contact with ethnic organizations			
Regular	30.2	36.1	(2,475)
Not at all	20.6	42.8	(1,689)
Lowering or waiving admissions criteria			
Regular	29.3	36.5	(1,897)
Not at all	16.7	43.6	(2,488)
Setting aside institutional funds for disadvantaged students			
Regular	30.4	36.3	(3,272)
Not at all	17.7	44.8	(2,103)

TABLE A4.4

RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES AND LIMITATIONS ON RECRUITMENT BY SCHOOL QUALITY

	School Quality		
	High	Medium	Low
A. Regular recruitment activities			
(1) Contact with high schools	83.0%(2,831)	79.7%(3,612)	72.7%(3,114)
(2) Participation in UB, ETS	68.5 (2,804)	65.2 (3,547)	52.2 (3,092)
(3) Contact with community agencies	54.9 (2,789)	54.2 (3,607)	36.8 (3,022)
(4) Contact with ethnic organizations	52.2 (2,808)	31.8 (3,590)	20.0 (3,090)
(5) Lowering or waiving admissions criteria	40.6 (2,754)	27.9 (3,438)	15.6 (3,065)
(6) Setting aside institutional funds	61.2 (2,770)	42.4 (3,534)	32.2 (3,032)
B. Factors limiting recruitment (n)	(2,831)	(3,612)	(3,114)
(1) Sufficient disadvantaged applicants	22.1	26.8	46.5
(2) Inadequate funds for recruitment	28.4	40.4	44.9
(3) Inadequate funds for financial aid	57.6	52.2	46.9
(4) Inadequate funds for supportive services	51.2	52.8	45.6
(5) Curriculum too rigorous	17.2	16.6	13.6
(6) Religious/social climate	3.3	6.2	5.4
(7) Unprepared for problems other schools have had	1.4	3.5	5.9

TABLE A4.5

SELECTED FINANCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF EOG INSTITUTIONS BY TYPE-CONTROL AND BY FEDERAL REGION

	Selected Financial Characteristics					
Selected Characteristics	(1) Local Tuition	(2) Room & Board	(3) Total	(4) Mean Total Financial Aid	(5) 4 / 3	(6) Mean EOG
Institutional Type and Control						
Private university	$1934 (53)	$1111 (52)	$3045	$1781 (542)	58.5%	$703 (626)
Public university	446 (116)	947 (107)	1393	1195 (2,246)	85.8	573 (2,504)
Private four-year	1474 (664)	953 (617)	2427	1439 (2,884)	59.3	638 (2,910)
Public four-year	390 (258)	832 (237)	1222	1024 (2,635)	83.8	494 (2,969)
Private two-year	1035 (120)	914 (105)	1949	1115 (234)	57.2	518 (234)
Public two-year	284 (374)	803 (107)	1087	924 (822)	85.0	414 (822)
Federal Region						
1	$1323 (140)	$1107 (109)	$2430	$1367 (481)	56.3%	$606 (573)
2	1130 (143)	1097 (97)	2227	1307 (522)	58.7	617 (780)
3	1194 (177)	971 (151)	2165	1264 (774)	58.4	536 (981)
4	767 (276)	780 (217)	1547	1053 (1,355)	68.1	500 (1,653)
5	1033 (289)	949 (216)	1982	1271 (1,821)	64.1	602 (2,232)
6	575 (143)	807 (123)	1382	1099 (863)	79.5	516 (1,163)
7	903 (146)	845 (120)	1748	1180 (759)	67.5	558 (894)
8	629 (72)	802 (64)	1431	1151 (441)	80.0	500 (507)
9	671 (128)	1036 (81)	1707	1481 (482)	86.8	645 (702)
10	713 (71)	899 (47)	1612	1247 (256)	77.4	565 (294)
Racial Composition						
Predominantly black	$804 (69)	$694 (62)	$1498	$1036 (889)	69.2%	$492 (970)
Predominantly white	929 (1,516)	931 (1,163)	1860	1251 (3,474)	67.2	570 (9,095)

TABLE A5.1

MEAN DOLLAR AMOUNT OF EOG AWARD BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Institutional Characteristics	Initial Year Grant	1st Renewal	2nd Renewal	3rd Renewal
Region				
1	$436	$458	$480	$534
2	461	503	533	549
3	440	469	501	463
4	398	441	474	464
5	430	462	508	441
6	392	428	611	377
7	410	458	502	458
8	402	437	459	355
9	436	511	550	541
10	410	453	505	492
Racial composition				
Predominantly white	$425	$463	$516	$459
Predominantly black	375	438	440	486
Institutional type and control				
Public university	$424	$437	$583	$382
Private university	530	556	557	578
Public four-year	379	400	414	404
Private four-year	481	518	539	518
Public two-year	311	361	358	-
Private two-year	418	474	506	-

TABLE A5.2

MEAN PERCENTAGE OF ALL STUDENTS RECEIVING FINANCIAL AID BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Institutional Characteristics	Mean Percentage	
All institutions	38.4%	(1,576)
Institutional type and control		
Public university	31.3%	(113)
Private university	46.2	(51)
Public four-year	38.9	(256)
Private four-year	42.1	(654)
Public two-year	23.5	(382)
Private two-year	40.0	(120)
Federal region		
1	31.6%	(141)
2	45.2	(140)
3	41.3	(176)
4	39.7	(272)
5	39.5	(282)
6	42.5	(137)
7	39.2	(143)
8	37.5	(72)
9	27.7	(144)
10	34.1	(69)
Racial composition		
Predominantly white	37.1%	(1,508)
Predominantly black	66.6	(68)

TABLE A5.3

MEAN DOLLAR AMOUNT OF EOG BY WHEN STUDENT FOUND OUT HE WAS ELIGIBLE FOR FINANCIAL AID AND BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE-CONTROL AND RACE

	Student Found Out He Was Eligible			
Institutional Characteristics	Before Senior Year	During Senior Year	After High School	In College
All Students	$583 (2,286)	$559 (3,374)	$548 (996)	$538 (1,229)
Institutional Type and Control				
Public university	$564 (639)	$558 (882)	$567 (173)	$588 (280)
Private university	705 (212)	710 (194)	756 (30)	692 (44)
Public four-year	483 (545)	481 (1,021)	492 (305)	494 (401)
Private four-year	654 (767)	644 (982)	621 (302)	607 (315)
Public two-year	418 (83)	411 (228)	451 (140)	404 (151)
Private two-year	599 (40)	572 (67)	528 (46)	425 (38)
Racial Composition				
Predominantly white	$589 (2,103)	$564 (3,083)	$560 (872)	$545 (1,125)
Predominantly black	512 (183)	506 (291)	466 (124)	466 (104)

TABLE A.5.4

STUDENTS' FINANCIAL AID PACKAGES BY SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

		Source of Financial Aid			
Institutional Characteristics	Number of Students	CWS + NDSL	CWS not NDSL	NDSL not CWS	Neither (EOG only)
(1) EOG Program Size					
Small	(1,840)	19.9	31.0	24.3	24.8
Medium	(3,225)	23.9	19.3	34.9	22.0
Large	(5,101)	19.7	15.0	47.3	18.0
(2) Institution generally requires that student:					
(a) Take a loan	(4,696)	23.2	16.1	43.3	17.4
(b) Work at term job	(4,045)	23.2	25.2	34.1	17.5
(3) Federal Region					
1 Boston	(578)	22.1	18.7	37.5	21.6
2 New York	(785)	12.2	23.8	27.3	36.7
3 Philadelphia	(989)	13.1	23.9	28.8	34.2
4 Atlanta	(1,657)	26.4	23.1	36.5	14.0
5 Chicago	(2,243)	21.4	14.0	44.6	19.9
6 Dallas	(1,170)	25.6	17.7	46.9	9.7
7 Kansas City	(916)	21.3	15.8	47.4	15.5
8 Denver	(510)	22.7	21.8	39.2	16.3
9 San Francisco	(731)	18.5	21.9	35.8	23.8
10 Seattle	(297)	26.6	22.9	31.3	19.2

TABLE A5.5

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RECEIVING STATE SCHOLARSHIPS OR OTHER SCHOLARSHIPS BY FEDERAL REGION

Federal Region	Percentage Receiving State Scholarships	Percentage Receiving Other Scholarships	(n)
1	18.3%	41.5%	(578)
2	49.0	24.3	(785)
3	36.1	29.3	(989)
4	4.8	14.8	(1,657)
5	22.4	31.1	(2,243)
6	1.6	13.1	(1,170)
7	8.8	28.9	(916)
8	6.3	19.8	(510)
9	15.5	21.1	(731)
10	7.7	15.5	(297)

TABLE A5.6

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RECEIVING STATE OR OTHER SCHOLARSHIPS (NON FEDERALLY FUNDED) BY SELECTED STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

	Non-Federal Source of Financial Aid		
Selected Student Characteristics	State Scholarship	Other Scholarship	(n)
(1) High School Quartile Placement			
Top quartile	22.3%	34.3%	(4,149)
Second quartile	17.2	17.2	(1,899)
Bottom half	14.1	16.1	(1,191)
(2) Gross Family Income			
Under $3000	14.4%	18.1%	(2,485)
$3000-5999	16.5	24.5	(4,320)
$6000 or more	21.2	29.4	(2,876)
(3) Race			
Black	10.7%	26.0%	(2,390)
White	21.9	27.7	(6,534)
(4) Mean SAT-V			
All students	508 (1,101)	509 (1,368)	
Black	408 (101)	417 (296)	
White	522 (838)	538 (945)	

TABLE A5.7

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE LOANS OR WORK STUDY JOBS: STUDENT SAMPLE AND FAO SAMPLE

(a) NDSL

FAO SAMPLE ("other loan")	Student Sample (NDSL)	
	Yes	No
Yes	4,314	898
No	468	2,036

% Agreement: 82% (7,716)

(b) CWS

FAO Sample	Student Sample	
	Yes	No
Yes	2,524	560
No	576	3,887

% Agreement: 85% (7,547)

TABLE A5.8

SOURCE OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID* BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics	Source of Federal Financial Aid				
	CWS and NDSL	CWS not NDSL	NDSL not CWS	Neither CWS nor NDSL	(n) (EOG only)
(1) **Student**					
Race and Family Income					
Under $3000					
Black	33.1%	19.4%	32.7%	14.8%	(459)
White	26.5	16.6	42.1	14.8	(1,042)
$3000-5999					
Black	30.9	18.4	32.7	17.9	(608)
White	24.0	14.2	43.8	18.0	(2,208)
$6000-7499					
Black	26.2	20.7	32.9	20.1	(164)
White	24.7	12.7	46.2	16.4	(928)
$7500-8999					
Black	35.3	13.7	39.2	11.8	(51)
White	21.8	13.3	47.6	17.3	(481)
$9000 or more					
Black	22.2	13.3	37.8	26.7	(45)
White	21.8	13.3	45.3	19.6	(316)
Student has State Scholarship					
Yes	15.7	14.0	34.0	36.4	(1,290)
No	26.5	15.6	43.5	14.4	(6,262)
(2) **Institutional**					
Type and Control					
Private university	19.6%	7.9	44.2	28.2	(453)
Public university	19.3	11.5	49.8	19.4	(1,874)

---

*Information about source of Federal financial aid is obtained from student, in contrast to data in Tables 5.4, 4.4, and 5.8 where information comes from FAO.

TABLE A5.8--Continued

Selected Characteristics	CWS and NDSL	CWS not NDSL	NDSL not CWS	Neither CWS nor NDSL	(n) (EOG only)
Private four-year	27.5%	14.0%	37.5%	20.9%	(2,284)
Public four-year	27.4	14.6	45.5	12.6	(2,145)
Private two-year	32.4	20.9	26.9	19.8	(182)
Public two-year	22.0	40.1	20.6	17.3	(554)
Racial Composition					
Predominantly white	23.9	14.8	42.6	18.7	(6,764)
Predominantly black	32.0	20.9	33.3	13.9	(628)

TABLE A5.9

PACKAGING OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID BY SELECTED STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Characteristics	EOG, CWS AND NDSL	All Unobligated Funds*	Other Sources	EOG Only	(n)
A. Student					
(1) Family Income					
Under $3000	59.3%	11.7%	25.7%	3.2%	(1,846)
$3000-5999	55.3	11.8	29.9	2.9	(3,215)
$6000-7499	48.5	13.0	35.8	2.8	(1,172)
$7500-8999	47.9	13.4	36.2	2.4	(582)
$9000 or more	43.4	12.8	42.6	1.1	(373)
(2) Race					
American Indian	78.8%	9.1%	6.1%	6.1%	(33)
Black	81.5	11.0	5.4	2.1	(2,390)
Oriental-American	76.8	19.5	3.7	-	(82)
Spanish-surnamed	72.8	17.1	6.7	3.4	(584)
White	79.8	13.4	4.8	2.1	(6,534)
B. Institutional					
(1) Racial Composition					
Predominantly black	84.5%	8.8%	3.3%	3.5%	(980)
Predominantly white	78.3	13.7	5.4	2.7	(9,183)
(2) Type-Control					
Private university	73.4%	24.6%	1.6%	.5%	(627)
Public university	76.5	13.5	6.2	3.8	(2,543)
Private four-year	72.8	19.4	5.9	1.8	(2,939)
Public four-year	86.8	6.3	3.9	3.0	(2,990)
Private two-year	72.8	13.0	4.7	9.4	(235)
Public two-year	84.7	6.5	6.5	2.3	(829)
Total	78.9%	13.2%	5.2%	2.8%	(10,166)

*Grants, scholarships, waivers; no loans or work.

TABLE A7.1

PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS REPORTING THAT EOG PROGRAM HAS HAD LITTLE IMPACT BY SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Institutional Characteristics	Percentage Reporting Little Impact
Number of problems	
None	29.2% (590)
One	33.6 (446)
Two	32.7 (297)
Three or more	35.5 (172)
Recruitment index	
Zero	40.5% (430)
One	37.4 (417)
Two	24.8 (318)
Three or more	20.6 (344)
Supportive services index	
Zero	45.3% (95)
One	37.2 (183)
Two	33.1 (519)
Three or four	27.4 (696)
Positive effects index	
Zero	52.5% (358)
One	33.9 (576)
Two	16.6 (576)

TABLE A7.2

EXTENT TO WHICH GATHERING RACE/ETHNIC DATA IS A PROBLEM BY NUMBER OF BLACK AND SPANISH STUDENTS, AND BY RACIAL COMPOSITION OF INSTITUTION

	Extent of Problem		
Item	Major	Minor	No Problem
Mean number black students	26.9 (352)	31.7 (607)	58.7 (423)
Mean number Spanish students	10.0 (238)	15.6 (348)	18.8 (171)
Racial composition of institution			
Predominantly white	26.2%	43.7%	30.1% (1,533)
Predominantly black	5.6	19.7	74.6 (71)

TABLE A7.3

"PERCEIVED SUCCESS" OF EOG PROGRAM BY SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Institutional Characteristics	Per Cent Reporting Program Definitely Successful	
Type and Control		
Private university	84.9%	(53)
Public university	79.5	(117)
Private four-year	83.6	(666)
Public four-year	80.8	(261)
Private two-year	84.4	(122)
Public two-year	72.9	(395)
Racial Composition		
Predominantly white	91.7	(72)
Predominantly black	79.8	(1,542)
School Quality		
High	83.0%	(382)
Medium	82.2	(482)
Low	77.3	(653)
Program Size		
Small	77.5%	(1,010)
Medium	84.5	(407)
Large	86.3	(197)

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONAL AND STUDENT RESPONSES BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND CONTROL

Section I. General Institutional Data

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(131)	(67)	(305)	(814)	(467)	(155)
Estimated number of Educational Opportunity Grants (Notification to Members of Congress, EOG Report No. 1-69)						
1- 99	14%	21%	30%	66%	89%	93%
100-199	11	22	25	24	7	5
200-299	13	25	16	6	2	1
300-399	11	12	12	2	1	1
400-499	13	6	6	*	*	-
500 and over	38	13	12	1	*	-
Actual number of Educational Opportunity Grants (for sample schools only)						
Under 25	2%	3%	3%	10%	44%	56%
25- 49	2	-	1	14	21	15
50- 99	5	5	8	30	13	15
100-149	4	10	15	21	12	12
150-199	8	15	10	7	2	-
200-299	13	28	21	8	3	3
300-399	13	18	19	6	2	-
400-499	19	3	8	2	-	-
500 or more	35	18	16	3	2	-
Other	(25)	(28)	(134)	(574)	(346)	(121)
Federal region						
Region 1	4%	13%	7%	10%	6%	17%
Region 2	3	17	8	10	10	6
Region 3	8	21	14	14	5	11
Region 4	15	6	20	15	17	32
Region 5	23	17	11	22	16	14
Region 6	13	11	15	6	9	7
Region 7	8	8	7	11	8	9
Region 8	10	2	8	2	6	1
Region 9	13	4	7	7	18	1
Region 10	4	2	4	3	8	2

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(131)	(67)	(305)	(814)	(467)	(155)
Race						
White	99%	99%	89%	94%	98%	96%
Negro	1	1	11	6	2	4
1966 total undergraduate enrollment						
Less than 500	6%	-%	5%	15%	12%	47%
500- 999	9	6	9	34	19	23
1000-2999	26	28	51	40	29	11
3000-4999	31	50	28	4	11	1
5000 or more	29	17	7	6	28	18
No information	(96)	(49)	(100)	(23)	(50)	(-)
Data on county in which institution is located:						
Percent urban						
Mean percent	70.0%	91.2%	64.7%	71.0%	66.1%	67.8%
S.D.	20.5	12.3	24.3	24.4	23.4	26.0
(N)	(127)	(66)	(291)	(795)	(460)	(140)
Percent rural						
Mean percent	7.9%	4.4%	11.8%	10.0%	10.4%	14.9%
S.D.	8.7	5.3	10.4	10.9	10.3	13.8
(N)	(111)	(21)	(243)	(591)	(384)	(112)
Percent non-white						
Mean percent	13.6%	17.2%	13.9%	11.1%	10.5%	15.5%
S.D.	17.4	15.3	15.3	12.0	12.3	15.9
(N)	(119)	(66)	(242)	(670)	(415)	(134)
Median family income						
Less than $4000	9%	3%	20%	9%	14%	25%
$4000-$4999	21	6	26	19	16	20
$5000-$5999	36	40	34	35	35	26
$6000-$6999	25	36	14	24	20	15
$7000 or more	8	15	7	13	14	13
No information	(1)	(-)	(5)	(8)	(1)	(4)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(131)	(67)	(305)	(814)	(467)	(155)
1969 total undergraduate enrollment						
Under 500	4%	3%	4%	22%	23%	58%
500- 999	5	-	7	40	29	27
1000-2999	6	20	36	36	37	13
3000-4999	11	43	25	2	7	1
5000 or more	74	34	28	1	3	-
No information	(3)	(2)	(1)	(11)	(7)	(13)

Section II. Institutional Questionnaire

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
1. In which academic year did the EOG program start at your school?						
1966-67	89%	98%	88%	80%	40%	48%
1967-68	8	2	8	10	20	26
1968-69	1	-	4	6	17	14
1969-70	2	-	*	4	22	12
No answer	(1)	(-)	(7)	(21)	(9)	(4)
2. How important was each of the following individuals in the decision to participate in the EOG program?						
(a) Financial aid officer						
Very important	96%	98%	91%	89%	86%	83%
Somewhat important	3	2	5	7	7	10
Not at all important	2	-	4	4	7	7
No answer	(3)	(-)	(16)	(29)	(34)	(8)
(b) President of institution						
Very important	64%	65%	69%	70%	73%	76%
Somewhat important	27	20	24	23	20	17
Not at all important	9	16	8	7	7	7
No answer	(3)	(2)	(11)	(22)	(17)	(8)
(c) Trustees						
Very important	12%	11%	11%	12%	18%	17%
Somewhat important	23	20	24	34	33	37
Not at all important	65	68	66	54	48	46
No answer	(17)	(9)	(50)	(89)	(60)	(31)
(d) Admissions officer						
Very important	18%	43%	19%	46%	26%	55%
Somewhat important	28	41	37	36	35	36
Not at all important	55	16	43	18	40	8
No answer	(9)	(4)	(26)	(54)	(57)	(16)

*Less than 1% designated by an asterisk.

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
(e) Faculty						
Very important	6%	8%	6%	6%	4%	4%
Somewhat important	24	29	33	31	30	41
Not at all important	70	63	60	63	65	55
No answer	(14)	(4)	(34)	(86)	(64)	(27)
3(a) Did you have enough EOG money for 1969-70 to give initial year grants to every student who qualified under the grant determination formula?						
Yes	33%	33%	27%	37%	35%	34%
No	67	67	73	63	65	66
No answer	(-)	(2)	(4)	(8)	(4)	(2)
(b) IF NO: In determining which of the financially eligible students should be awarded an initial year EOG, to whom did you give preference?						
Students already enrolled	19%	12%	25%	34%	40%	46%
Entering freshmen	87	100	86	79	68	68
Students with better academic performance	17	12	23	25	20	18
Students of extreme financial need	97	91	98	95	99	98
Students of minority group background	65	70	61	68	58	61
Those who don't qualify for other forms of financial aid	13	15	12	19	16	20
In-state or local residents	24	-	19	6	29	9
Other	11	12	12	8	10	9
4. Of full-time students who have exceptional financial need, which types are generally not awarded EOGs?						
First term students	2%	-	3%	2%	2%	2%
Transfer students	13	17	11	17	14	18
Married students	54	30	43	38	25	26
Students whose grades are poor, even though not failing	6	8	16	15	12	15
Evening students (full-time)	41	43	43	35	34	35

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public (117)	Private (53)	Public (262)	Private (667)	Public (398)	Private (123)
5(a) Does the financial aid office have established practices regarding the packaging of financial aid for an EOG recipient?						
Yes	88%	75%	86%	77%	82%	83%
No	12	24	14	22	18	17
No answer	(2)	(-)	(2)	(11)	(3)	(4)
(b) In general, is each EOG recipient at your institution required to:						
Take out a loan?						
Yes	52%	58%	54%	53%	40%	41%
No	40	42	40	46	57	58
Either loan or work	8	-	6	1	3	2
No answer	(3)	(1)	(12)	(28)	(53)	(10)
Work at a term job?						
Yes	36%	30%	44%	48%	69%	61%
No	56	70	51	51	28	37
Either work or loan	8	-	6	1	3	2
No answer	(8)	(3)	(19)	(39)	(26)	(7)
(c) Do you lighten the term job requirements for EOG students, as compared with other students who receive financial aid?						
Yes	33%	37%	31%	28%	26%	15%
No	67	63	69	72	74	85
No answer	(5)	(7)	(9)	(41)	(15)	(6)
6. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following aspects of the EOG program is a problem at your institution:						
(a) Finding students who are eligible for EOGs						
Major problem	6%	19%	5%	19%	10%	13%
Minor problem	28	27	20	30	29	24
No problem	66	54	76	51	61	63
No answer	(1)	(1)	(1)	(8)	(-)	(1)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
6(b) Estimating initial year funds that will be needed						
Major problem	21%	29%	18%	35%	27%	32%
Minor problem	56	48	56	52	52	46
No problem	23	23	26	13	22	22
No answer	(2)	(1)	(1)	(6)	(-)	(1)
(c) Estimating renewal year funds that will be needed						
Major problem	13%	19%	15%	14%	22%	16%
Minor problem	63	53	56	54	57	63
No problem	24	28	29	32	21	21
No answer	(1)	(-)	(1)	(6)	(5)	(1)
(d) Keeping informed about changes in the program						
Major problem	9%	8%	6%	11%	18%	14%
Minor problem	31	35	36	39	47	52
No problem	60	58	58	49	34	34
No answer	(2)	(1)	(1)	(7)	(1)	(1)
(e) Keeping the information on each student which EOG forms require						
Major problem	22%	15%	13%	12%	17%	13%
Minor problem	46	42	46	44	51	39
No problem	32	42	40	44	32	48
No answer	(2)	(1)	(-)	(9)	(3)	(2)
(f) Gathering race and ethnic data						
Major problem	46%	43%	27%	22%	24%	14%
Minor problem	32	45	43	43	45	40
No problem	22	11	29	35	31	47
No answer	(1)	(-)	(-)	(10)	(-)	(5)
(g) Timing on notification by USOE of availability of funds						
Major problem	59%	69%	56%	62%	43%	48%
Minor problem	32	19	30	30	42	39
No problem	9	12	14	8	16	13
No answer	(1)	(1)	(3)	(13)	(6)	(8)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
6(h) Other problem						
Major problem	75%	86%	80%	80%	81%	75%
Minor problem	17	14	11	13	5	-
No problem	8	-	8	6	14	25
No answer	(105)	(46)	(227)	(591)	(355)	(115)
7(a) Was the total EOG allocation to your institution this year adequate for your needs, inadequate, or more than adequate?						
Adequate	40%	35%	28%	41%	38%	34%
Inadequate	56	58	67	53	57	60
More than adequate	4	8	5	5	5	6
No answer	(4)	(1)	(3)	(6)	(3)	(2)
(b) If your school had the same total amount of EOG funds, and there were no Federal restrictions in determining the size of an individual grant, would you prefer to allocate:						
Smaller amounts to more students	31%	17%	38%	33%	45%	37%
Larger amounts to fewer students	7	23	5	14	6	14
According to the present formula	62	60	57	52	49	49
No answer	(1)	(1)	(1)	(9)	(1)	(2)
8. In actual practice, how often do you find that you limit the size of individual EOG awards in order to stretch the allocation over a larger number of students?						
Often	20%	10%	31%	22%	40%	34%
Occasionally	43	44	42	48	39	49
Never	36	46	27	30	20	17
No answer	(2)	(1)	(3)	(5)	(3)	(3)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
9. If you are to have sufficient time to determine the number and size of EOG awards for a given year, what is the latest month that USOE should notify you about the size of your allocation?						
January	8%	14%	12%	13%	2%	10%
February	29	37	17	22	9	18
March	37	27	36	37	32	38
April	12	14	21	13	23	20
May	8	2	8	6	15	8
June	2	2	1	2	9	1
July-December	5	4	4	7	10	5
No answer	(2)	(2)	(3)	(20)	(16)	(8)
10. How often do you speak in person or on the telephone to each of the following about matters relating to the EOG program?						
(a) EOG Washington Branch						
Several times a month or more	1%	2%	1%	*	*	-%
Several times a year	31	28	13	12	13	15
Almost never	68	70	87	88	87	85
No answer	(2)	(3)	(-)	(6)	(8)	(4)
(b) DSFA (Washington)						
Several times a month or more	1%	-	1%	*	*	1%
Several times a year	21	26	13	12	15	17
Almost never	78	73	86	88	85	82
No answer	(2)	(4)	(4)	(8)	(8)	(3)
(c) Regional office of DHEW/OE						
Several times a month or more	12%	10%	10%	4%	4%	2%
Several times a year	71	63	71	71	70	69
Almost never	17	27	18	25	26	29
No answer	(1)	(2)	(-)	(6)	(8)	(2)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
10(d) **Aid administrators at other institutions**						
Several times a month or more	23%	20%	23%	16%	22%	11%
Several times a year	62	59	64	68	66	75
Almost never	14	22	13	16	12	14
No answer	(-)	(2)	(-)	(4)	(1)	(-)
(e) **Other administrators at your institution**						
Several times a month or more	45%	39%	52%	54%	59%	58%
Several times a year	34	47	38	36	30	38
Almost never	21	14	10	9	14	4
No answer	(3)	(2)	(-)	(7)	(4)	(1)
11. Does your institution utilize any of the following means for recruiting disadvantaged students?						
(a) **Conditional grant commitments to 10th or 11th graders**						
Regularly	3%	4%	8%	3%	2%	2%
Occasionally	20	21	23	20	13	15
Not at all	77	75	69	77	85	83
No answer	(-)	(-)	(3)	(6)	(8)	(2)
(b) **Regular contact with high schools in poor areas**						
Regularly	74%	92%	74%	67%	74%	58%
Occasionally	21	6	23	27	22	35
Not at all	5	2	3	6	4	6
No answer	(-)	(-)	(1)	(2)	(4)	(1)
(c) **Participation in programs like Upward Bound**						
Regularly	68%	83%	54%	40%	27%	33%
Occasionally	20	13	30	38	38	37
Not at all	12	4	16	22	35	30
No answer	(-)	(1)	(5)	(13)	(8)	(1)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
11(d) Contact with community agencies, church groups, etc.						
Regularly	44%	54%	37%	47%	41%	45%
Occasionally	47	42	52	43	49	51
Not at all	9	4	11	10	10	4
No answer	(-)	(1)	(4)	(5)	(4)	(1)
(e) Contact with Urban League, NAACP, etc.						
Regularly	35%	58%	23%	27%	24%	18%
Occasionally	42	36	45	44	38	43
Not at all	23	6	32	28	38	38
No answer	(-)	(1)	(4)	(6)	(6)	(1)
(f) Coordination of recruitment activities with other colleges						
Regularly	28%	33%	25%	21%	19%	15%
Occasionally	46	38	39	33	37	41
Not at all	27	29	36	46	43	44
No answer	(1)	(1)	(2)	(10)	(10)	(1)
(g) Lowering or waiving admissions criteria						
Regularly	27%	44%	19%	24%	22%	16%
Occasionally	34	44	37	51	18	50
Not at all	39	12	44	25	60	34
No answer	(1)	(3)	(5)	(7)	(31)	(4)
(h) Setting aside funds exclusively for assistance to disadvantaged students						
Regularly	43%	74%	28%	44%	28%	32%
Occasionally	30	14	33	32	34	42
Not at all	27	12	39	25	38	26
No answer	(2)	(2)	(8)	(15)	(11)	(2)
(i) Other means						
Regularly	77%	100%	58%	66%	79%	71%
Occasionally	15	-	23	21	8	-
Not at all	8	-	19	13	13	29
No answer	(104)	(47)	(236)	(605)	(359)	(116)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Pub-lic	Pri-vate	Pub-lic	Pri-vate	Pub-lic	Pri-vate
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398	(123)
12(a) Does your institution have a special program to recruit disadvantaged students?						
Yes	68%	79%	53%	44%	42%	30%
No	32	21	47	56	58	70
No answer	(-)	(-)	(5)	(7)	(4)	(1)
IF YES: (b) Office or title of administrator of special program:						
Special title	49%	28%	47%	20%	32%	14%
Financial aid officer or bursar	5	2	9	9	18	24
Registrar	11	37	17	40	9	30
Student dean or counselor	5	-	7	8	20	3
Other college officer	26	23	14	17	13	24
No information given (but have program)	2	5	5	3	3	5
No answer	(38)	(10)	(125)	(376)	(232)	(86)
(c) Is directing this program the sole or primary responsibility of the person indicated above?						
Yes	69%	42%	52%	30%	38%	39%
No	31	58	48	70	62	61
No answer	(39)	(10)	(126)	(378)	(233)	(87)
(d) Are EOG funds used to provide financial aid to students recruited under this program?						
Yes	99%	98%	98%	97%	93%	91%
No	1	2	1	3	7	8
No answer	(39)	(10)	(126)	(375)	(234)	(88)
IF NO SPECIAL PROGRAM: (e) Have you ever had such a program?						
Yes	13%	33%	6%	8%	6%	4%
No	87	67	94	92	94	96
No answer	(78)	(44)	(147)	(300)	(181)	(43)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public (117)	Private (53)	Public (262)	Private (667)	Public (398)	Private (123)
13. Institutions indicating that they do not specifically attempt to recruit disadvantaged students:						
Do not attempt to recruit	14%	8%	24%	24%	30%	29%
No answer	(85)	(92)	(76)	(76)	(70)	(71)
14. Which of the following factors either limit or prevent your institution from recruiting disadvantaged students?						
Sufficient applicants who fall into the "disadvantaged" category	22%	13%	40%	28%	45%	39%
Inadequate funds for recruitment activities	41	21	42	38	42	41
Inadequate funds for financial aid to such students	44	49	46	62	41	49
Inadequate funds for supportive services	50	43	46	55	41	44
The curriculum is too rigorous for such students	18	17	12	22	4	6
Religious or social climate would be hard for students to adjust to	3	-	3	10	1	3
Unprepared for kinds of problems other schools have had	3	-	5	9	3	6
Concerned about reaction of alumni, community, etc.	-	-	1	1	1	-
Other	14	6	8	7	13	11

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
15(a) What is your best estimate of the proportion of all full-time undergraduates for whom the regular admissions criteria are modified?						
Mean percent	3.7%	6.7%	4.5%	7.7%	7.8%	9.9%
S.D.	3.2	8.3	4.3	9.2	8.5	7.5
(N)	(66)	(45)	(152)	(498)	(96)	(69)
(b) For what proportion of EOG recipients would you say regular admissions criteria are modified?						
Mean percent	18.8%	31.4%	15.1%	19.0%	24.4%	23.6%
S.D.	21.0	27.3	19.3	20.9	27.4	24.6
(N)	(54)	(42)	(139)	(459)	(74)	(66)
16(a) Are the following services available at your institution for students who are having difficulty with academic work?						
Remedial courses	69%	66%	59%	52%	92%	75%
Special tutoring	80	85	71	65	56	58
Extra counseling	85	98	80	81	89	80
Other	10	11	8	9	11	7
No services available	-	-	-	-	-	-
17(a) If any undergraduate's academic work falls below accepted limits, is he required to attend remedial, counseling or tutorial programs?						
Yes	21%	28%	27%	37%	39%	53%
No	79	72	73	63	61	47
No answer	(4)	(3)	(29)	(73)	(24)	(18)
(b) Are any entering freshmen required to attend such programs on the basis of their records at the time of admission?						
Yes	51%	47%	49%	56%	68%	74%
No	49	53	51	44	32	26
No answer	(3)	(-)	(32)	(81)	(18)	(15)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
18(a) What is your best estimate of the proportion of all full-time undergraduate students who have used remedial or tutorial services while enrolled at your institution?						
Mean percent	9.5%	9.6%	10.7%	12.2%	19.1%	20.4%
S.D.	13.0	10.5	10.3	14.3	15.7	17.6
(N)	(88)	(44)	(190)	(506)	(344)	(103)
(b) About what proportion of current EOG recipients would you estimate have received such services while enrolled at your institution?						
Mean percent	22.5%	28.4%	20.9%	21.0%	32.9%	29.4%
S.D.	22.0	25.5	21.7	22.0	27.0	25.2
(N)	(87)	(42)	(189)	(483)	(331)	(100)
19. Are students who are having difficulty with academic work encouraged to take fewer credits than the usual full-time load?						
Yes	79%	84%	86%	89%	92%	86%
No	21	16	14	11	8	14
No answer	(4)	(3)	(8)	(19)	(7)	(2)
20(a) Are students ever employed as tutors for other students who require special academic work?						
Yes	87%	92%	75%	72%	60%	48%
No	13	8	25	28	40	52
No answer	(1)	(-)	(3)	(6)	(2)	(2)
IF YES: **(b)** Have college Work-Study funds been used for this purpose?						
Yes	63%	48%	67%	44%	52%	33%
No	37	52	33	56	48	67
No answer	(11)	(3)	(55)	(143)	(118)	(51)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
21. If, at the end of a semester, an EOG student is doing failing work, is the financial aid office notified?						
Yes	68%	81%	75%	80%	77%	82%
No	32	19	25	20	23	18
No answer	(2)	(-)	(5)	(11)	(9)	(3)
22. Would you say that in general, the EOG program at your institution has been successful in its stated purpose?						
Definitely yes Probably yes	79%	85%	81%	84%	73%	84%
Probably or definitely no	20	15	19	16	27	16
No answer	(-)	(-)	(1)	(1)	(3)	(1)
23(a) Have you had any increase in enrollment of black or other minority group students at your institution since 1966?						
Yes	95%	98%	89%	87%	79%	79%
No	5	2	11	13	21	21
No answer	(4)	(-)	(8)	(16)	(25)	(6)
IF YES: (b) Would you say that this increase has been:						
Largely due to the availability of EOG funds	13%	4%	11%	21%	8%	28%
Partly due to EOG, partly other factors	72	75	64	61	58	55
Mostly due to other factors	15	21	25	18	34	16
No answer	(11)	(1)	(36)	(93)	(98)	(31)
(c) Has your institution been under pressure from the community to admit minority group students?						
A great deal of pressure	7%	17%	4%	2%	2%	2%
Some pressure	50	54	20	26	16	16
No pressure	43	29	76	72	83	82
No answer	(2)	(1)	(7)	(17)	(18)	(2)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
24. Which of the following statements describe effects which EOG has had at your institution?						
Enabled us to award grants for the first time	19%	6%	24%	10%	36%	19%
Enabled us to distribute financial aid to more students	98	89	97	94	95	95
Enabled us to award more to each student	90	71	92	85	92	88
Fostered unrealistic expectations among students about financial aid available	35	31	37	36	24	28
Made us more willing to take a chance on "high-risk" students	59	60	59	59	46	53
Made students less willing to take loans or work	41	21	39	26	28	28
Brought a new type of student to institution	63	57	61	66	52	64
Made it more difficult to raise scholarship money from private sources	13	18	10	6	4	2
Served as an impetus for recruitment efforts among minority groups	80	86	73	78	62	73
Has had little impact at our institution	26	31	33	28	36	40
25(a) Does your institution have any plans to withdraw from the EOG program in the next few years?						
Yes	-%	-%	-%	*	*	-%
Possibly	2	-	1	2	2	3
No	98	100	99	98	98	97
No answer	(-)	(-)	(1)	(3)	(3)	(-)
(c) Do you plan to expand, reduce or maintain the EOG program at its current level during the next few years?						
Expand the program	89%	90%	88%	81%	89%	83%
Reduce the program	1	-	*	*	*	-
Maintain the program at its current level	10	10	12	19	11	17
No answer	(6)	(1)	(4)	(25)	(24)	(8)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
26. What are the annual charges for a full-time undergraduate student at your institution for:						
(a) Tuition and fees for in-state or local residents:						
Mean amount	$446	$1934	$390	$1474	$284	$1035
S.D.	231	656	227	567	279	474
(N)	(116)	(53)	(258)	(664)	(374)	(120)
(b) Tuition and fees for out-of-state, or out-of-district, residents:						
Mean amount	$1070	$1082	$839	$1542	$591	$1119
S.D.	411	622	322	1271	414	865
(N)	(112)	(5)	(255)	(41)	(374)	(22)
(c) Room and board for those living in college facilities on campus:						
Mean amount	$948	$1111	$832	$953	$803	$914
S.D.	169	247	195	211	242	320
(N)	(107)	(52)	(237)	(617)	(107)	(105)
27. Approximate percent of the full-time undergraduate student body receiving any form of financial aid (i.e., grants, scholarships, loans, tuition waivers, etc):						
Mean percent	31.3%	46.2%	38.9%	47.1%	23.5%	40.0%
S.D.	15.6	17.3	20.7	19.2	15.6	24.4
(N)	(113)	(51)	(256)	(654)	(382)	(120)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
28(a) Number of students receiving EOG initial year grants for 1969-70:						
Under 25	9%	17%	16%	51%	51%	66%
25- 49	10	17	20	28	28	21
50- 99	21	40	24	14	15	11
100-149	15	6	19	4	4	1
150-199	10	4	9	1	1	1
200-299	18	11	7	1	11	-
300 or more	18	6	5	*	1	-
No answer	(3)	(-)	(6)	(11)	(13)	(5)
Mean number of IY's	178	102	102	37	39	24
S.D.	164	118	96	41	52	25
(N)	(114)	(53)	(256)	(656)	(385)	(118)
(b) Number of students receiving EOG renewal grants for 1969-70:						
Under 25	12%	2%	15%	30%	80%	76%
25- 49	5	8	15	32	13	16
50- 99	11	27	17	24	5	6
100-149	12	27	17	7	1	-
150-199	9	15	13	4	1	-
200-299	21	13	11	2	-	1
300 or more	30	8	11	1	*	1
No answer	(7)	(1)	(9)	(31)	(112)	(22)
Mean number of RY's	245	181	141	56	20	29
S.D.	224	227	144	60	46	95
(N)	(111)	(53)	(254)	(636)	(286)	(101)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
29. Number of all students receiving initial and renewal EOG's during 1969-70,						
(a) Mean number of blacks	82	57	76	30	19	17
S.D.	115	75	150	85	42	44
(N)	(92)	(51)	(236)	(595)	(315)	(103)
(b) Mean number of Spanish-surnamed Americans	34	9	26	9	11	2
S.D.	61	12	54	45	20	2
(N)	(64)	(44)	(135)	(294)	(190)	(34)
(c) Mean number of American Indians	7	4	5	2	2	10
S.D.	10	6	10	2	3	20
(N)	(54)	(11)	(72)	(102)	(65)	(11)
(d) Mean number of Oriental Americans	8	7	6	3	3	2
S.D.	14	8	14	7	5	2
(N)	(64)	(40)	(82)	(143)	(58)	(9)
30. Mean percent of all students currently receiving EOG's who:						
(a) Are male	52.6%	62.7%	45.0%	56.1%	50.2%	49.1%
S.D.	14.2	19.3	16.2	22.7	16.8	19.7
(N)	(101)	(46)	(242)	(520)	(359)	(91)
(b) Are married	7.2%	4.6%	9.2%	8.4%	13.0%	8.6%
S.D.	7.0	3.6	9.9	8.7	11.1	7.9
(N)	(89)	(35)	(210)	(457)	(271)	(53)
(c) Live on campus	59.7%	64.8%	64.9%	72.5%	58.0%	70.1%
S.D.	26.4	27.1	25.3	25.4	30.5	26.9
(N)	(89)	(42)	(217)	(577)	(98)	(101)
(d) Were in the top quartile (high) of their high school graduating class	49.2%	58.1%	38.7%	45.4%	22.6%	27.8%
S.D.	24.4	29.4	22.0	25.1	16.5	17.4
(N)	(83)	(42)	(195)	(508)	(265)	(88)

	University Public	University Private	Four-Year Public	Four-Year Private	Two-Year Public	Two-Year Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
(e) Were in the 2nd quartile of their high school graduating class	29.7%	28.0%	37.4%	33.8%	32.9%	36.1%
S.D.	14.7	22.7	16.5	17.3	17.9	17.7
(N)	(80)	(42)	(200)	(506)	(289)	(99)
(f) Were in the bottom half (low) of their high school graduating class	22.1%	19.6%	24.5%	24.6%	48.5%	43.3%
S.D.	20.6	19.3	19.0	20.0	24.8	23.5
(N)	(77)	(27)	(188)	(448)	(305)	(95)
31. Number of all 1968-69 EOG recipients:						
Under 25	8%	2%	6%	13%	38%	44%
25- 49	3	4	9	20	27	25
50- 99	7	15	14	33	22	22
100-149	7	12	13	16	7	6
150-199	6	15	12	7	4	1
200-299	12	15	14	6	1	1
300 or more	59	36	31	5	1	1
No answer	(13)	(1)	(16)	(44)	(107)	(19)
Mean number of 1968-69 awards	457	271	241	99	52	44
S.D.	414	205	213	102	58	49
(N)	(110)	(52)	(246)	(623)	(291)	(104)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public (117)	Private (53)	Public (262)	Private (667)	Public (398)	Private (123)
32. Mean percent of all 1968-69 EOG recipients who:						
(a) Reenrolled for 1969-70	66.8%	71.2%	64.7%	66.8%	41.9%	46.0%
S.D.	15.0	12.9	14.7	13.4	16.3	18.5
(N)	(90)	(42)	(233)	(583)	(247)	(91)
(b) Graduated	14.0%	15.9%	14.1%	15.9%	25.0%	34.3%
S.D.	12.5	5.9	9.6	8.8	15.0	19.8
(N)	(84)	(42)	(215)	(544)	(204)	(84)
(c) Transferred to another institution	6.9%	6.5%	6.0%	8.1%	19.0%	21.4%
S.D.	9.3	7.2	7.0	7.6	12.9	18.9
(N)	(71)	(28)	(178)	(436)	(197)	(68)
(d) Dropped out	16.3%	6.9%	14.8%	12.0%	24.2%	17.6%
S.D.	10.9	6.6	10.2	10.0	13.4	11.7
(N)	(82)	(38)	(211)	(533)	(226)	(81)
(e) 1968-69 freshmen EOG recipients who reenrolled for 1969-70	69.9%	79.7%	70.3%	73.5%	49.4%	61.6%
S.D.	15.2	16.5	18.3	21.2	23.7	24.7
(N)	(101)	(50)	(243)	(606)	(265)	(97)
34. Mean number of full-time undergraduates who are:						
(a) Blacks	346	344	402	86	114	46
S.D.	552	1016	852	320	265	87
(N)	(84)	(43)	(223)	(599)	(317)	(107)
(b) Spanish-surnamed Americans	128	45	136	53	110	9
S.D.	235	63	431	415	263	19
(N)	(65)	(38)	(160)	(415)	(241)	(55)
(c) American Indians	51	11	29	5	17	15
S.D.	105	16	57	11	30	49
(N)	(65)	(22)	(126)	(200)	(187)	(21)
(d) Oriental Americans	106	33	45	13	33	5
S.D.	173	36	134	48	74	7
(N)	(67)	(37)	(154)	(350)	(185)	(40)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(117)	(53)	(262)	(667)	(398)	(123)
35(a) Percent of those who applied for admission as freshmen for 1969-70 who were accepted:						
Mean percent	75.8%	58.6%	75.9%	73.5%	93.1%	82.6%
S.D.	19.2	23.0	22.0	19.7	14.2	18.4
(N)	(104)	(51)	(237)	(634)	(374)	(118)
(b) Percent of last year's freshmen who reenrolled for 1969-70:						
Mean percent	73.1%	86.2%	71.2%	76.0%	57.3%	66.6%
S.D.	11.8	9.0	13.1	15.2	15.8	14.3
(N)	(93)	(50)	(228)	(625)	(350)	(119)
(c) Mean percent of all full-time undergraduates who:						
Are male	59.3%	67.3%	53.4%	58.2%	60.5%	55.6%
S.D.	11.3	14.3	14.9	21.9	10.3	18.6
(N)	(100)	(51)	(240)	(551)	(365)	(97)
Are married	17.2%	7.8%	17.5%	9.6%	16.2%	9.8%
S.D.	11.6	5.2	11.9	8.6	12.1	12.2
(N)	(87)	(41)	(227)	(605)	(349)	(98)
Live on campus	42.4%	52.5%	46.3%	66.1%	35.1%	60.6%
S.D.	23.2	24.2	23.3	23.4	24.9	27.1
(N)	(89)	(47)	(218)	(597)	(101)	(106)
Were in the top quartile of their high school graduating class	52.2%	67.4%	39.3%	43.4%	16.6%	20.5%
S.D.	23.9	22.2	20.0	23.6	9.3	11.8
(N)	(91)	(47)	(210)	(580)	(334)	(109)

Section III. Student Data Form

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public (2,543)	Private (627)	Public (2,990)	Private (2,939)	Public (829)	Private (235)
1. **Year in school**						
Freshman	36%	27%	32%	29%	58%	50%
Sophomore	26	28	26	28	40	37
Junior	24	25	22	25	1	5
Senior	15	18	19	18	*	7
Other	*	1	*	*	1	*
No answer	(7)	(3)	(11)	(10)	(7)	(2)
2. **Transfer student**						
Yes	13%	9%	15%	8%	13%	7%
No	87	91	85	92	87	93
No answer	(69)	(23)	(110)	(136)	(38)	(19)
3. **Is student classified as:**						
Resident student	72%	60%	67%	70%	33%	56%
Non-resident student	28	40	32	30	67	44
No answer	(88)	(30)	(59)	(47)	(23)	(3)
4. FOR NON-FRESHMEN:						
(a) **Present quartile placement**						
Top quarter	28%	28%	28%	28%	21%	26%
2nd quarter	33	28	37	32	30	27
3rd quarter	22	26	23	25	34	30
Bottom quarter	16	18	12	15	14	16
No answer	(1,440)	(344)	(1,666)	(1,541)	(567)	(132)
(b) **Present GPA in college**						
Mean GPA	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.4
S.D.	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.6
(N)	(2,093)	(439)	(2,449)	(2,309)	(512)	(168)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,543)	(627)	(2,990)	(2,939)	(829)	(235)
5. Type of grant						
Initial year	41%	34%	42%	38%	73%	64%
1st year renewal	31	34	31	32	24	26
2nd year renewal	19	21	18	20	2	2
3rd year renewal	8	10	8	9	*	2
More than one	*	*	1	*	-	6
No answer	(29)	(5)	(29)	(38)	(9)	(1)
6. Sources of financial aid						
College Work-Study	28%	27%	43%	43%	65%	53%
Other student employment	6	11	4	14	7	8
Guaranteed loan	9	12	6	15	12	12
NDSL	64	66	68	55	38	48
Tuition waiver	6	3	5	5	7	5
State scholarship	16	27	14	22	6	15
Athletic scholarship	1	1	2	3	3	4
Other scholarship	21	51	12	37	13	19
Veterans' benefits	1	1	1	2	2	-
Disability benefits	1	*	*	*	1	-
Social Security Survivors' benefits	4	5	4	4	6	1
Other source	8	2	6	7	7	5
7. Amount of student's 1970 EOG						
Mean amount of EOG	$573	$703	$494	$638	$414	$518
S.D.	209	243	197	237	192	261
(N)	(2,504)	(626)	(2,969)	(2,910)	(823)	(234)
8. Gross family income						
Mean family income	$4841	$5410	$4374	$5172	$4287	$4225
S.D.						
(N)	(2,377)	(591)	(2,806)	(2,717)	(750)	(217)
9. Number of dependents in student's family						
Mean number of dependents	4	4	4	4	4	4
S.D.	2	2	2	2	2	2
(N)	(2,349)	(577)	(2,815)	(2,742)	(772)	(219)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,543)	(627)	(2,990)	(2,939)	(839)	(235)
10. Is student classified as:						
Independent	13%	11%	17%	12%	25%	19%
Parent-supported	87	89	83	88	75	81
No answer	(42)	(12)	(51)	(68)	(18)	(12)
11. High school program of student						
College preparatory	95%	94%	90%	92%	77%	68%
Non-college preparatory	5	6	10	8	23	32
No answer	(641)	(52)	(601)	(340)	(146)	(59)
12. Student's high school rank						
Mean rank in high school	1.5	1.5	2.2	2.1	4.0	3.4
S.D.	1.8	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.6	2.7
(N)	(1,512)	(462)	(1,803)	(2,376)	(495)	(158)
13. Student's quartile placement in high school						
Top quarter	68%	70%	54%	57%	27%	40%
2nd quarter	21	19	31	26	32	27
3rd quarter	7	8	12	12	24	22
Bottom quarter	3	3	3	5	17	10
No answer	(829)	(120)	(972)	(632)	(307)	(64)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,543)	(627)	(2,990)	(2,939)	(829)	(235)
14(a) SAT-Verbal scores						
Mean SAT-Verbal	500	543	425	470	408	436
S.D.	104	106	100	115	100	93
(N)	(746)	(439)	(769)	(1,890)	(190)	(91)
(b) SAT Math scores						
Mean SAT Math	528	571	447	492	431	450
S.D.	110	113	102	117	100	90
(N)	(743)	(439)	(770)	(1,886)	(190)	(91)
(c) ACT Composite						
Mean ACT Composite	24	30	22	26	22	20
S.D.	9	21	12	18	16	12
(N)	(780)	(91)	(1,203)	(586)	(261)	(73)
(d) National Merit scores						
Mean National Merit score	128	118	106	107	99	122
S.D.	87	20	36	24	20	103
(N)	(204)	(26)	(78)	(182)	(21)	(3)
15. Student admitted under:						
Regular provisions	91%	91%	90%	92%	93%	90%
Special provisions	9	9	10	8	7	10
No answer	(101)	(56)	(166)	(92)	(41)	(12)
16. Was student considered "high-risk"?						
Yes	9%	9%	12%	10%	18%	18%
No	91	91	88	90	82	82
No answer	(159)	(56)	(313)	(115)	(61)	(12)
17. Supportive services received by student						
(a) Remedial English, math, reading, etc.	4%	4%	8%	8%	19%	11%
(b) Special tutoring	5	4	8	4	3	1
(c) Extra counseling	8	18	12	6	15	9
(d) Reduced program	4	2	4	5	6	5

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,543)	(627)	(2,990)	(2,939)	(829)	(235)
18. Race or ethnic group of student						
American Indian	*%	-%	*%	*%	*%	4%
American Negro	18	27	30	26	22	28
Oriental American	1	2	*	1	*	-
Spanish-surnamed American	8	3	6	4	11	4
Other (white)	73	68	63	69	66	65
No answer	(227)	(57)	(141)	(64)	(12)	(40)
19. Sex of student						
Male	52%	61%	42%	48%	51%	46%
Female	48	39	58	52	49	54
No answer	(59)	(5)	(32)	(26)	(24)	(5)
20. Student's (home region)						
New England	4%	17%	2%	8%	8%	10%
Mid Atlantic	3	29	9	21	16	23
East North Central	28	19	15	18	8	13
West North Central	15	10	13	15	10	2
South Atlantic	9	8	16	14	14	30
East South Central	7	2	12	7	5	17
West South Central	9	8	16	6	7	1
Mountain	11	1	4	3	14	1
Pacific	8	6	11	4	19	1
Other	4	*	*	2	*	3
No answer	(139)	-	(91)	(8)	(19)	(1)

Section IV. Student Questionnaire

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
1(a) What is your present class in college?						
Freshman	32%	27%	30%	30%	52%	48%
Sophomore	24	28	26	27	39	38
Junior	23	25	22	24	3	6
Senior	20	18	20	18	4	6
Other	1	2	2	1	2	2
No answer	(22)	(3)	(28)	(15)	(10)	(3)
(b) For how many years have you been taking courses in any college, either as a full-time or part-time student?						
One	32%	27%	29%	30%	49%	47%
Two	24	28	27	27	40	39
Three	23	25	22	24	8	9
Four	18	16	17	16	2	5
Five	3	3	3	2	1	-
Six	*	1	1	*	*	-
Seven	*	*	1	*	*	-
No answer	(15)	(2)	(24)	(19)	(6)	(3)
(c) Is the number of credits you are taking this semester considered a full-time program or less?						
Full-time	98%	98%	97%	97%	96%	97%
About 3/4 time	2	2	3	2	3	3
Less than 3/4 time	*	*	1	1	1	-
No answer	(32)	(5)	(47)	(32)	(8)	(5)
2(a) About how many miles from your permanent home is the college you are attending?						
Mean number of miles	16	29	13	27	12	25
S.D.	24	50	22	40	31	51
(N)	(1,921)	(426)	(2,300)	(2,390)	(528)	(185)
(b) Are you living in your permanent home while you attend college?						
Yes	20%	32%	22%	25%	55%	36%
No	80	68	78	75	45	64
No answer	(27)	(2)	(34)	(32)	(11)	(3)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Pub-lic	Pri-vate	Pub-lic	Pri-vate	Pub-lic	Pri-vate
	(2,3[illegible]3)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
IF NO: (c) Where are you living this term while attending college?						
Dormitory	56%	63%	65%	77%	35%	70%
Fraternity or sorority house	5	5	1	3	*	*
Relative's home	3	4	3	4	13	6
Co-op housing	2	1	*	*	*	3
Off-campus home or apartment under college control	5	4	7	4	8	3
Off-campus home or apartment not under college control	26	22	20	10	35	13
Other	3	2	2	3	8	5
No answer	(331)	(154)	(447)	(566)	(356)	(63)
3(a) When did you first decide you would go to college?						
I always just assumed I would go	48%	53%	40%	48%	32%	40%
Before high school	19	23	17	20	13	14
During 10th or 11th grade	10	16	21	17	18	16
During my senior year in high school	10	6	16	10	22	16
After graduating from high school	4	2	6	5	14	13
No answer	(27)	(4)	(43)	(18)	(23)	(5)
(b) When did you first decide you would go to the college you are now attending?						
I always just assumed I would go	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Before high school	4	3	2	3	1	2
During 10th or 11th grade	21	17	15	15	9	11
During my senior year in high school	52	65	56	60	50	48
After graduating from high school	18	13	25	19	37	36
No answer	(72)	(17)	(95)	(98)	(53)	(10)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
4(a) How important was each of the following persons or groups in your decision to attend this college?						
(1) Your parents						
Very important	33%	28%	41%	37%	42%	41%
Somewhat important	42	43	40	43	39	42
Not at all important	24	28	19	20	20	17
No answer	(33)	(3)	(51)	(39)	(34)	(5)
(2) If married: your husband or wife						
Very important	13%	5%	15%	11%	20%	17%
Somewhat important	8	4	11	8	11	14
Not at all important	78	91	75	81	69	70
No answer	(1,844)	(477)	(2,126)	(2,486)	(645)	(195)
(3) High school teacher or guidance counselor						
Very important	21%	21%	27%	25%	26%	25%
Somewhat important	38	38	37	35	39	36
Not at all important	41	40	35	40	35	39
No answer	(52)	(8)	(86)	(105)	(39)	(6)
(4) High school friends						
Very important	11%	7%	10%	7%	8%	10%
Somewhat important	39	32	40	29	37	36
Not at all important	50	61	49	63	54	55
No answer	(55)	(17)	(118)	(140)	(55)	(13)
(5) A representative from the college						
Very important	9%	14%	14%	22%	18%	24%
Somewhat important	23	23	28	32	27	28
Not at all important	68	63	58	47	55	48
No answer	(85)	(27)	(142)	(162)	(70)	(16)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
4(a)						
(6) Graduates or students from the college						
Very important	17%	17%	22%	25%	13%	20%
Somewhat important	30	25	30	28	25	25
Not at all important	52	58	48	46	62	55
No answer	(76)	(21)	(129)	(169)	(75)	(14)
(7) People you worked with on a job						
Very important	5%	5%	5%	4%	10%	8%
Somewhat important	13	9	15	9	19	13
Not at all important	82	86	80	87	71	79
No answer	(124)	(29)	(204)	(244)	(77)	(15)
(8) Some community group, agency, or program						
Very important	7%	7%	8%	6%	12%	9%
Somewhat important	6	6	10	7	9	11
Not at all important	86	87	82	87	79	79
No answer	(130)	(36)	(210)	(271)	(89)	(21)
(9) Other person or group						
Very important	36%	38%	36%	40%	39%	34%
Somewhat important	5	5	8	10	9	11
Not at all important	59	57	56	50	53	54
No answer	(974)	(252)	(1,243)	(1,319)	(372)	(97)

		University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
		Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
		(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
4(b)	Most important person or group in decision to attend this college:						
	Your parents	29%	26%	31%	26%	31%	30%
	If married: your husband or wife	2	1	2	1	3	3
	High school teacher or guidance counselor	18	21	20	18	18	15
	High school friends	9	5	6	4	4	6
	A representative from the college	5	11	7	12	10	11
	Graduates or students from the college	12	11	13	14	7	12
	People you worked with on a job	2	2	1	1	3	1
	Some community group, agency, or program	4	3	3	3	5	2
	Other person or group	19	20	16	20	18	19
	No answer	(266)	(78)	(297)	(305)	(96)	(40)
(c)	How important was each of the following factors in your decision to attend this college?						
(1)	The opportunity to live at home						
	A major reason	12%	18%	13%	14%	29%	23%
	A minor reason	7	15	10	9	18	13
	Unrelated to decision	80	68	77	77	53	65
	No answer	(77)	(25)	(109)	(154)	(43)	(11)
(2)	The opportunity to live away from home						
	A major reason	25%	26%	21%	24%	10%	14%
	A minor reason	32	31	34	36	20	30
	Unrelated to decision	43	43	45	41	70	56
	No answer	(77)	(38)	(95)	(151)	(74)	(11)
(3)	The opportunity to be with students like yourself						
	A major reason	31%	30%	31%	36%	24%	32%
	A minor reason	40	34	42	38	41	38
	Unrelated to decision	28	35	27	26	35	30
	No answer	(54)	(16)	(75)	(97)	(44)	(7)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
4(c)						
(4) The low cost of the college						
A major reason	45%	13%	57%	13%	71%	34%
A minor reason	27	13	27	19	16	28
Unrelated to decision	28	74	16	68	13	39
No answer	(70)	(38)	(79)	(177)	(34)	(8)
(5) The availability of financial aid						
A major reason	77%	76%	79%	74%	74%	78%
A minor reason	16	15	15	17	16	15
Unrelated to decision	7	9	6	8	10	7
No answer	(37)	(13)	(41)	(70)	(28)	(5)
(6) The academic program						
A major reason	74%	75%	65%	70%	57%	56%
A minor reason	22	21	28	24	33	35
Unrelated to decision	5	4	7	6	10	9
No answer	(46)	(14)	(68)	(87)	(45)	(6)
(7) The religious program or atmosphere						
A major reason	4%	9%	5%	29%	4%	26%
A minor reason	20	20	25	30	16	22
Unrelated to decision	76	71	70	41	80	53
No answer	(56)	(14)	(92)	(100)	(57)	(9)
(8) The athletic program						
A major reason	5%	5%	9%	10%	11%	8%
A minor reason	17	15	16	18	14	18
Unrelated to decision	78	79	74	72	74	74
No answer	(62)	(16)	(93)	(126)	(55)	(6)
(9) Some other factor						
A major reason	24%	33%	26%	33%	28%	34%
A minor reason	3	3	5	5	4	5
Unrelated to decision	72	64	69	62	68	61
No answer	(1,354)	(340)	(1,683)	(1,859)	(505)	(151)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
4(d) Most important factor in decision to attend this college						
The opportunity to live at home	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	6%
The opportunity to live away from home	3	4	4	3	2	2
The opportunity to be with students like yourself	4	4	5	5	4	4
The low cost of the college	12	4	18	2	31	14
The availability of financial aid	40	42	36	41	30	38
The academic program	31	34	23	24	15	14
The religious program or atmosphere	*	3	*	11	*	13
The athletic program	1	1	3	3	6	4
Some other factor	6	6	5	7	7	6
No answer	(160)	(49)	(222)	(235)	(86)	(27)
5. At the time you applied to the college you are presently attending, had you applied to any other college?						
Yes	47%	73%	45%	57%	38%	41%
No	52	27	55	43	62	59
No answer	(19)	(8)	(30)	(34)	(19)	(3)
IF YES: Were you accepted by another college?						
Yes	78%	88%	77%	82%	61%	66%
No	22	11	23	18	39	34
No answer	(1,037)	(133)	(1,305)	(1,108)	(472)	(129)
6. How much of your college and living expenses this year is being financed through each of the following sources?						
(a) Support from parents						
Pays a great deal	5%	6%	6%	9%	6%	7%
Pays some	42	46	46	49	37	42
Pays none	54	48	48	42	57	51
No answer	(34)	(10)	(55)	(18)	(36)	(9)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
6(b) Support from spouse						
Pays a great deal	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%
Pays some	6	2	8	6	8	5
Pays none	92	96	90	92	87	90
No answer	(787)	(217)	(978)	(1,220)	(308)	(88)
(c) A state scholarship						
Pays a great deal	9%	20%	7%	12%	4%	10%
Pays some	15	17	15	12	10	10
Pays none	76	63	78	76	85	80
No answer	(187)	(32)	(285)	(307)	(106)	(25)
(d) An Educational Opportunity Grant						
Pays a great deal	64%	53%	63%	55%	58%	55%
Pays some	34	44	34	43	38	44
Pays none	2	3	2	2	5	1
No answer	(38)	(9)	(50)	(51)	(25)	(4)
(e) An athletic scholarship						
Pays a great deal	*	*	1%	2%	3%	3%
Pays some	*	*	1	3	3	3
Pays none	99	99	98	95	94	94
No answer	(185)	(48)	(268)	(314)	(97)	(19)
(f) A scholarship or tuition waiver from the college						
Pays a great deal	10%	26%	5%	18%	10%	10%
Pays some	16	24	11	25	14	22
Pays none	74	50	84	56	76	68
No answer	(154)	(38)	(256)	(257)	(94)	(17)
(g) Other scholarship						
Pays a great deal	6%	8%	4%	5%	5%	4%
Pays some	12	14	9	17	14	12
Pays none	82	78	87	79	82	84
No answer	(218)	(55)	(313)	(357)	(110)	(27)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
6(h) College Work-Study (Federal)						
Pays a great deal	12%	6%	16%	12%	25%	24%
Pays some	19	23	27	32	32	33
Pays none	68	72	57	56	42	43
No answer	(151)	(38)	(179)	(221)	(58)	(14)
(i) Institutional student employment						
Pays a great deal	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	6%
Pays some	11	15	10	21	8	11
Pays none	86	83	87	76	90	83
No answer	(206)	(53)	(321)	(364)	(119)	(24)
(j) A National Defense Student Loan						
Pays a great deal	39%	31%	44%	35%	22%	25%
Pays some	31	34	29	32	22	27
Pays none	29	35	27	33	55	48
No answer	(77)	(30)	(113)	(153)	(68)	(13)
(k) A Guaranteed Loan						
Pays a great deal	5%	5%	3%	5%	4%	8%
Pays some	4	7	4	6	5	5
Pays none	92	88	92	88	91	87
No answer	(196)	(48)	(281)	(334)	(104)	(20)
(l) Other loan						
Pays a great deal	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%
Pays some	5	8	5	7	4	3
Pays none	92	88	92	89	92	94
No answer	(206)	(54)	(299)	(347)	(107)	(25)
(m) Social Security Survivors' Benefits						
Pays a great deal	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
Pays some	9	8	7	8	6	4
Pays none	89	91	91	90	92	94
No answer	(185)	(55)	(282)	(335)	(99)	(21)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
6(n) **Veterans' Benefits (G.I. Bill)**						
Pays a great deal	*	1%	*	1%	2%	3%
Pays some	2	2	2	2	2	2
Pays none	97	97	97	97	96	95
No answer	(223)	(59)	(308)	(370)	(116)	(24)
(o) **Other Source**						
Pays a great deal	28%	29%	27%	25%	30%	19%
Pays some	39	41	35	42	29	38
Pays none	34	30	38	32	40	43
No answer	(1,301)	(319)	(1,719)	(1,826)	(545)	(159)
Other Source (Second named)						
Pays a great deal	7%	9%	6%	7%	6%	4%
Pays some	15	18	10	17	12	14
Pays none	77	73	83	76	81	82
No answer	(1,904)	(477)	(2,317)	(2,567)	(717)	(210)
7(a) Please estimate the total amount of financial aid you are receiving this year through the college.						
Mean amount of financial aid	$1195	$1781	$1024	$1439	$924	$1115
S.D.	601	940	545	NA	509	715
N	(2,246)	(542)	(2,635)	(2,884)	(822)	(234)
(b) How much money are you receiving this year from your Educational Opportunity Grant?						
Mean amount of EOG	$559	$679	$474	$609	$417	$493
S.D.	217	553	208	550	215	252
N	(2,207)	(533)	(2,584)	(2,806)	(792)	(238)
(c) Do you find that the overall amount of financial aid you are receiving this year is sufficient to meet your basic college expenses?						
Yes	66%	63%	65%	60%	67%	65%
No	34	37	35	39	33	35
No answer	(60)	(21)	(105)	(107)	(47)	(15)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
7(d) IF YES: Is it sufficient to meet various other expenses as well?						
Yes	36%	33%	34%	30%	40%	28%
No	64	67	66	70	60	72
No answer	(834)	(225)	(1,011)	(1,243)	(314)	(91)
(e) IF NO to 7(c): How much additional money do you estimate you will need to meet basic expenses?						
Mean amount needed	$432	$563	$370	$448	$393	$384
S.D.	268	297	252	267	281	280
N	(877)	(235)	(1,069)	(1,243)	(298)	(93)
8(a) In what month were you notified about the amount and kind of financial aid you would be receiving this year?						
January	1%	2%	3%	3%	6%	7%
February	1	1	2	2	4	3
March	2	4	1	5	1	2
April	6	10	4	8	2	2
May	14	10	11	13	6	9
June	13	10	11	9	7	9
July	21	21	20	20	11	10
August	27	32	32	27	24	23
September	9	7	11	9	22	21
October	2	1	2	1	10	6
November	1	1	2	1	3	3
December	2	3	2	2	4	6
No answer	(133)	(31)	(186)	(190)	(47)	(20)
(b) Would you have preferred to have been notified sooner?						
Yes	69%	72%	65%	64%	59%	56%
No	31	28	35	36	41	44
No answer	(86)	(20)	(133)	(151)	(48)	(131)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
9. Which of the following statements best describes what you probably would have done if you had not received financial aid from this college?						
Attended same college full-time	30%	18%	28%	20%	31%	25%
Attended same college part-time	13	7	12	5	14	7
Attended different college	20	51	13	40	7	16
Not attended college	37	24	47	35	49	52
No answer	(38)	(13)	(50)	(52)	(25)	(2)
10. Will you need some kind of financial aid next year in order to continue your education?						
Yes	89%	93%	87%	90%	92%	92%
No	11	7	13	10	8	8
No answer	(52)	(12)	(76)	(68)	(36)	(10)
11(a) When did you first find out that you might be eligible for financial aid?						
Before my senior year in high school	32%	44%	23%	33%	13%	19%
During my senior year in high school	44	41	44	41	36	36
After I finished high school, but before I started college	9	6	14	12	23	24
After I was in college	14	9	18	14	27	21
No answer	(30)	(11)	(56)	(37)	(26)	(5)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
11(b) How did you happen to find out you might be eligible for financial aid?						
High school principal, teacher, or guidance person	71%	74%	67%	66%	50%	51%
High school friends	26	35	22	25	18	17
Parents or other relatives	53	57	49	53	38	42
Upward Bound or Educational Talent Search Program	5	5	5	5	6	2
Community group	6	9	6	6	8	10
College catalogue or college publication	60	71	56	68	46	60
College officer or representative	30	40	38	54	49	57
College friends	32	28	35	32	30	33
Other	(11)	(11)	(10)	(11)	(14)	(11)
What most influenced you to apply for financial aid?						
High school principal, teacher, or guidance person	36%	34%	36%	28%	24%	19%
High school friends	1	1	1	1	1	1
Parents or other relatives	20	20	17	17	14	12
Upward Bound or Educational Talent Search	4	4	4	4	3	3
Community group	2	3	3	4	6	9
College catalogue or college publication	11	10	7	10	8	9
College officer or representative	9	12	13	20	24	29
College friends	6	4	8	4	7	6
Other	11	11	11	11	13	11
No answer	(124)	(36)	(175)	(189)	(81)	(22)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
12(a) Please tell us which statement you agree with more.						
Grants should be awarded to any student who wants to, but cannot afford to go to college	65%	62%	67%	68%	76%	77%
Grants should be awarded primarily to students with high academic promise who could not otherwise afford to go to college	36	38	33	32	24	23
No answer	(37)	(13)	(58)	(48)	(27)	(2)
(b) Please tell us which statement you agree with more.						
Working at a job during the school year should be avoided if at all possible	85%	87%	79%	80%	78%	74%
It's better to work for the money to pay for college than to accept a grant	15	13	21	20	22	26
No answer	(78)	(21)	(121)	(131)	(59)	(8)
(c) Please tell us which statement you agree with more.						
Borrowing money to pay for college should only be done as a last resort.	49%	62%	44%	55%	51%	57%
Loans are a good way to finance a college education	51	38	56	45	49	43
No answer	(51)	(13)	(109)	(94)	(42)	(6)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
12(d) Please tell us which statement you agree with more.						
Even with a good education I will have a hard time getting the right kind of job.	20%	23%	17%	17%	16%	15%
With a good education I should have little difficulty getting the kind of job I want	80	77	83	83	84	85
No answer	(44)	(20)	(80)	(84)	(33)	(5)
13(a) Would you say that most students at your college come from families with:						
About as much money as your family	17%	14%	28%	22%	38%	34%
More money than your family	82	85	71	77	59	65
Less money than your family	1	1	1	1	3	1
No answer	(25)	(7)	(37)	(35)	(13)	(3)
(b) Compared to most students in this college, would you say your grades are:						
Below average	5%	7%	3%	3%	4%	4%
Average	52	52	61	59	62	67
Above average	43	41	36	38	34	30
No answer	(12)	(10)	(19)	(27)	(9)	(-)
(c) How hard do you work to get good grades at college?						
Very hard	24%	26%	25%	25%	25%	24%
Quite hard	55	50	57	57	56	58
Not so hard	21	24	19	18	18	18
No answer	(13)	(8)	(18)	(28)	(9)	(1)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
14(a) How do you find college work compared to what you had expected?						
About as difficult	55%	60%	55%	60%	54%	54%
Less difficult	25	23	29	25	28	29
More difficult	20	17	17	16	18	17
No answer	(13)	(7)	(20)	(22)	(10)	(-)
(b) How friendly do you find most students here compared to what you had expected?						
About as friendly	56%	60%	52%	51%	52%	49%
More friendly	30	26	36	40	37	42
Less friendly	14	13	11	9	11	9
No answer	(13)	(6)	(28)	(24)	(10)	(1)
(c) In general, how satisfied are you with the college you are presently attending?						
Very satisfied	52%	39%	49%	48%	48%	49%
Somewhat satisfied	35	41	37	37	36	37
Somewhat dissatisfied	11	16	12	12	11	11
Very dissatisfied	3	4	2	3	5	3
No answer	(12)	(8)	(20)	(23)	(8)	(-)
15(a) How important to you is each of the following purposes of a college education?						
(1) To develop skills and knowledge directly applicable to a career						
Very important	78%	67%	85%	77%	86%	88%
Somewhat important	20	30	14	21	13	11
Not important	2	3	1	2	1	1
No answer	(12)	(7)	(23)	(24)	(12)	(-)
(2) To obtain a broad general education and appreciation of ideas						
Very important	67%	70%	65%	70%	60%	62%
Somewhat important	32	29	34	29	39	37
Not important	1	1	1	1	1	2
No answer	(12)	(7)	(26)	(22)	(14)	(2)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
15(a)						
(3) To acquire an understanding and interest in world and community affairs						
Very important	63%	63%	65%	67%	59%	64%
Somewhat important	35	35	33	31	37	34
Not important	3	2	2	2	4	3
No answer	(17)	(7)	(26)	(30)	(14)	(1)
(b) Which purpose of a college education is most important to you?						
To develop skills and knowledge directly applicable to a career	54%	46%	61%	51%	65%	64%
To obtain a broad general education and appreciation of ideas	30	34	23	32	20	20
To acquire an understanding and interest in world and community affairs	16	20	16	18	15	16
No answer	(73)	(20)	(107)	(122)	(53)	(9)
(c) How important is it for a college to emphasize each of the following?						
(1) Good vocational, professional or technical training						
Very important	76%	66%	84%	74%	87%	83%
Somewhat important	21	30	15	24	12	16
Not important	3	4	1	3	1	1
No answer	(11)	(5)	(26)	(24)	(11)	(-)
(2) A moral atmosphere that is friendly and cooperative						
Very important	63%	64%	66%	71%	65%	73%
Somewhat important	33	33	32	27	32	25
Not important	4	4	2	2	3	3
No answer	(18)	(7)	(32)	(26)	(14)	(2)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
15(c)						
(3) High academic standards, research and scholarship of faculty						
Very important	38%	39%	38%	39%	35%	35%
Somewhat important	49	48	51	52	55	56
Not important	12	12	11	10	10	9
No answer	(19)	(6)	(42)	(38)	(16)	(3)
(4) Expression of conflicting points of view, student and faculty freedom in making policy						
Very important	56%	60%	50%	53%	45%	39%
Somewhat important	39	34	43	41	46	51
Not important	5	5	7	6	8	10
No answer	(20)	(6)	(44)	(41)	(16)	(1)
(d) Which do you think it is most important for a college to emphasize?						
Vocational or professional training	56%	44%	64%	50%	66%	63%
Moral atmosphere	18	21	18	26	17	23
High academic standards	8	10	5	8	6	3
Expression of conflicting points of view	17	25	13	16	11	10
No answer	(86)	(24)	(133)	(148)	(63)	(16)
16(a) While you were in high school, did any representative from the college you're presently attending visit your high school to speak with students?						
Yes	48%	38%	45%	43%	40%	36%
No	36	48	40	46	44	51
Don't know	16	15	15	12	17	13
No answer	(50)	(9)	(57)	(47)	(19)	(11)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2.333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
16(b) While you were in high school, did you hear about programs like Upward Bound or Educational Talent Search where high school students get special help to prepare them for college?						
Yes	16%	18%	18%	18%	17%	18%
No	84	82	82	82	83	82
No answer	(49)	(11)	(59)	(52)	(18)	(9)
(c) Did you participate in any program like Upward Bound?						
Yes	20%	19%	18%	16%	17%	15%
No	80	81	82	84	83	85
No answer	(1,628)	(395)	(1,843)	(2,055)	(582)	(181)
17(a) Does the college you are attending offer any of the following opportunities to students who may need special help?						
(1) Remedial courses						
Yes	67%	47%	58%	54%	77%	73%
No	6	15	10	19	7	11
Don't know	26	37	31	26	17	16
No answer	(57)	(10)	(75)	(86)	(32)	(10)
(2) Special tutoring						
Yes	72%	63%	65%	60%	47%	41%
No	7	11	11	15	17	24
Don't know	21	26	24	25	36	35
No answer	(58)	(11)	(72)	(92)	(33)	(10)
(3) Extra counseling or guidance						
Yes	83%	79%	78%	80%	82%	77%
No	3	6	5	7	5	7
Don't know	13	15	16	13	14	16
No answer	(56)	(10)	(79)	(79)	(31)	(11)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public (2,333)	Private (578)	Public (2,740)	Private (3,014)	Public (870)	Private (254)
17(a)						
(4) **Permission to take fewer credits**						
Yes	72%	62%	70%	72%	71%	66%
No	4	9	5	7	4	9
Don't know	24	29	24	21	25	25
No answer	(56)	(17)	(77)	(77)	(33)	(10)
(b) Which of the above have *you* used at this college?						
Remedial courses	7%	6%	11%	11%	21%	20%
Special tutoring	9	10	12	9	8	6
Extra counseling	25	22	24	25	34	33
Fewer credits	10	9	11	9	12	9
18. How far do you expect to go in school?						
Some college but no degree	*%	*%	1%	*%	2%	2%
Associate of Arts degree (2 years)	1	-	1	*	16	12
B.A. or B.S. degree	36	24	40	35	33	41
Graduate or Professional degree (e.g., M.A., M.S., M.D., Ph.D.)	50	65	48	52	32	30
Undecided	13	11	10	11	17	15
No answer	(58)	(12)	(69)	(68)	(26)	(8)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
19(a) When you finish your education, what sort of job or field do you think you will go into?						
College teaching, scientific research, academic research	12%	15%	10%	11%	8%	6%
Law, medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine	10	16	4	7	4	6
Ministry	1	1	*	4	1	1
Elementary or high school teaching	29	19	45	36	28	33
Social work, library work, guidance, psychology, home economics	10	11	11	14	12	13
Architecture, engineering, chemistry	10	12	4	4	7	5
Nursing, occupational therapy, medical or dental or laboratory technician, etc.	4	2	4	4	8	8
Business, sales, administration, real estate, computer programming, insurance, accounting	11	12	11	11	13	14
Public relations, advertising, journalism, publishing, writing, entertainment, art, music	7	10	5	6	7	5
Secretary, stewardess, office work, modeling	2	1	2	1	6	6
Machinist, construction work, electrician, foreman in mine or factory	1	*	1	*	2	*
Armed forces, policeman, fireman, detective, sheriff	1	1	1	1	1	1
Farming, ranching, lumbering, fishing	2	*	1	*	1	*
Housewife	*	-	1	1	1	1
Undecided	179	46	131	180	67	9
No answer	(65)	(20)	(69)	(73)	(23)	(9)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
19(b) Please give your best estimate of the amount of money you expect to earn annually about five years after you finish your education.						
Under $5000	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%
$5000-$7499	14	6	18	15	17	25
$7500-$9999	29	20	34	29	29	26
$10,000-$12,499	25	29	22	23	24	21
$12,500-$14,999	17	19	13	14	11	14
$15,000-$19,999	7	13	7	10	8	6
$20,000 or more	6	10	4	5	6	3
I don't expect to work	1	1	1	1	1	3
No answer	(113)	(30)	(97)	(152)	(45)	(15)
20. Sex						
Male	51%	58%	40%	47%	47%	45%
Female	49	42	60	53	53	55
No answer	(18)	(8)	(18)	(17)	(6)	(1)
21. Race						
American Indian	1%	1%	*%	*%	*%	7%
Negro (Black, Afro-American, West Indian)	14	21	27	24	24	21
Oriental American	2	2	1	1	*	-
White	81	74	70	74	71	68
Other	3	2	2	1	4	4
No answer	(37)	(14)	(48)	(29)	(20)	(4)
22. Ethnic background						
Puerto Rican	3%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%
Mexican-American	5	1	5	2	9	2
Other Spanish-speaking or Latin American background	1	2	1	1	3	3
None of these	91	95	93	95	87	93
No answer	(90)	(35)	(151)	(161)	(52)	(20)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Pri vate	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
23. Age last birthday						
Under 18	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
18	20	19	18	19	25	25
19	25	28	25	26	30	33
20	22	24	22	24	20	18
21	18	16	18	17	9	12
22	8	8	8	6	2	2
23	2	2	3	2	3	3
24-25	2	1	1	1	3	3
26-29	1	1	2	1	3	1
30-55	1	1	2	1	4	5
No answer	(32)	(11)	(31)	(27)	(8)	(1)
24. Religion (optional)						
Catholic	28%	47%	26%	31%	34%	26%
Protestant	47	28	53	50	42	48
Jewish	2	6	1	2	2	1
None	11	11	8	6	9	5
Other	12	8	12	11	14	19
No answer	(143)	(53)	(173)	(151)	(60)	(20)
25. Marital status						
Single	89%	94%	87%	92%	84%	87%
Married and living with spouse	8	5	9	6	10	10
Separated or divorced	1	1	2	*	5	3
Other	1	1	1	1	1	*
No answer	(18)	(8)	(22)	(14)	(3)	(5)
26. Where did you live most of the time while you were growing up?						
On a farm, ranch of reservation	21%	7%	25%	17%	18%	29%
In a small town	27	17	34	27	32	25
In a moderate size town or city	26	24	22	27	23	25
In a suburb of a large city	10	16	7	11	10	7
In a large city	16	35	13	18	17	13
No answer	(29)	(8)	(27)	(28)	(8)	(3)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
27(a) Have you ever served on full-time active duty in the armed services?						
Yes	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	4%
No	98	99	98	99	97	96
No answer	(54)	(18)	(56)	(62)	(14)	(9)
IF YES:						
(b) For how many years?						
Mean years in armed services	3	2	3	3	3	3
S.D.	2	1	2	1	2	1
(N)	(39)	(8)	(41)	(41)	(24)	(11)
28(a) Was your father born in the United States?						
Yes	90%	85%	94%	92%	91%	90%
No	10	15	6	8	9	10
No answer	(24)	(9)	(22)	(23)	(7)	(2)
(c) Was your mother born in the United States?						
Yes	91%	86%	94%	92%	92%	90%
No	9	14	6	8	8	10
No answer	(24)	(9)	(19)	(22)	(5)	(2)
29(a) Is your father living?						
Yes	84%	81%	84%	83%	80%	84%
No	16	19	16	17	20	16
No answer	(46)	(14)	(53)	(42)	(18)	(4)
IF NO:						
(b) How old were you when he died?						
Mean age	15	13	16	14	15	16
S.D.	11	8	13	10	10	14
(N)	(345)	(100)	(395)	(464)	(156)	(40)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
29(c) Is your mother living?						
Yes	96%	96%	95%	96%	96%	93%
No	4	4	5	4	4	7
No answer	(30)	(13)	(25)	(34)	(7)	(2)
IF NO: (d) How old were you when she died?						
Mean age	16	15	16	15	14	13
S.D.	11	9	12	10	9	7
(N)	(94)	(21)	(127)	(136)	(34)	(16)
30. How far in school did your parents (and spouse, if married) go?						
Father						
No schooling, or some grammar school	11%	9%	15%	12%	16%	23%
Completed grammar school (8th grade)	19	14	23	19	21	20
Some high school (9th, 10th, 11th grade)	16	18	20	17	22	19
Completed high school	32	34	26	28	26	23
Some college	13	14	10	13	10	6
Completed college	5	6	3	6	3	6
Graduate or professional school	4	6	2	6	2	4
No answer	(66)	(23)	(78)	(92)	(38)	(6)
Mother						
No schooling, or some grammar school	6%	5%	7%	7%	10%	12%
Completed grammar school (8th grade)	13	11	17	14	14	20
Some high school (9th, 10th, 11th grade)	17	20	22	20	26	21
Completed high school	42	41	37	38	34	32
Some college	15	16	11	14	9	10
Completed college	5	5	3	5	4	2
Graduate or professional school	2	2	2	2	3	2
No answer	(46)	(13)	(36)	(50)	(21)	(7)

		University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
		Pub-lic	Pri-vate	Pub-lic	Pri-vate	Pub-lic	Pri-vate
30.	(Cont'd)	(2,333	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
	Husband or wife						
	No schooling, or some grammar school	-%	-%	*%	-%	1%	-%
	Completed grammar school (8th grade)	2	-	1	1	5	-
	Some high school (9th, 10th, 11th grade)	2	4	8	6	11	17
	Completed high school	22	24	26	24	31	38
	Some college	48	44	42	36	39	29
	Completed college	19	16	17	23	7	13
	Graduate or professional school	6	12	6	10	6	4
	No answer	(2,132)	(553)	(2,475)	(2,817)	(775)	(230)
31(a)	How many older brothers and sisters do you have?						
	Mean	2	2	3	2	2	3
	S.D.	2	1	2	2	2	2
	(N)	(1,487)	(350)	(1,823)	(1,890)	(592)	(183)
(b)	If you have any older brothers or sisters: Have any of them had a year or more of college?						
	Yes	70%	72%	62%	65%	55%	52%
	No	30	28	38	35	45	48
	No answer	(822)	(222)	(873)	(1,072)	(257)	(67)
(c)	How many younger brothers and sisters do you have?						
	Mean	3	3	3	3	3	3
	S.D.	2	2	2	2	2	2
	(N)	(1,721)	(422)	(2,066)	(2,267)	(645)	(187)
(d)	If you have any younger brothers or sisters: Have any of them had a year or more of college?						
	Yes	20%	20%	20%	18%	14%	7%
	No	80	80	80	82	86	93
	No answer	(570)	(152)	(644)	(714)	(201)	(67)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
32(a) During the time that you were in high school, who was the head of your family?						
My father or stepfather	75%	72%	75%	75%	69%	77%
My mother or stepmother	22	25	21	21	25	18
A grandparent	2	1	2	2	2	2
A brother or sister	*	-	1	*	1	1
Another relative	1	2	1	1	1	1
Someone else	1	1	1	1	1	*
No answer	(47)	(11)	(58)	(59)	(28)	(4)
(b) What was the major occupation of the head of your family during the time you were in high school?						
Professional or semi-professional	8%	10%	6%	12%	5%	8%
Business owner or manager, farm owner	21	11	17	16	14	15
Salesman or clerical worker	14	17	9	12	11	7
Skilled worker	15	17	17	16	19	17
Protective or service worker	4	6	4	4	4	5
Semi-skilled worker	14	15	16	14	15	13
Workman or laborer	16	15	21	17	19	22
Unemployed	9	8	10	9	13	12
Don't know	(27)	(5)	(30)	(27)	(22)	(4)
No answer	(78)	(12)	(87)	(87)	(50)	(9)
(c) Has your family ever received welfare payments?						
Yes	16%	13%	17%	15%	25%	19%
No	84	87	83	85	75	81
No answer	(54)	(15)	(73)	(84)	(31)	(5)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
33(a) About how much would you estimate your family's total income from all sources was last year?						
Under $3000	16%	10%	21%	15%	20%	18%
$3000-$5999	38	34	40	36	37	39
$6000-$7499	15	21	14	16	12	16
$7500-$8999	9	11	8	10	8	10
$9000 or more	11	14	7	10	9	6
Don't know	11	10	10	12	14	12
No answer	(72)	(19)	(85)	(79)	(44)	(10)
(b) Are you contributing money to your family?						
Yes, quite a bit	2%	3%	2%	2%	4%	2%
Yes, a little	18	22	16	18	27	21
No	80	75	82	81	69	77
No answer	(41)	(16)	(68)	(72)	(34)	(6)
34(a) When did you graduate from high school or receive a high school equivalency diploma?						
Before 1964	3%	3%	4%	3%	7%	7%
1964-1965	4	5	6	4	4	4
1966	17	15	16	16	6	5
1967	21	24	20	23	8	9
1968	23	26	25	26	33	37
1969	31	27	28	28	44	38
No answer	(41)	(7)	(51)	(55)	(30)	(5)
(b) About how many students were in your high school graduating class?						
Mean	278	356	236	270	287	224
S.D.	262	372	333	388	468	367
(N)	(2,273)	(564)	(2,631)	(2,929)	(796)	(243)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
35(a) Was there an academic or college preparatory program in your high school?						
Yes	76%	88%	67%	77%	71%	64%
No	24	12	33	23	29	36
No answer	(49)	(10)	(58)	(62)	(35)	(7)
(b) Which of the following describes the high school program in which you were enrolled?						
General	29%	16%	38%	27%	39%	43%
Academic or college preparatory	66	81	55	67	46	45
Commercial or business	2	1	4	4	10	7
Vocational	1	2	2	2	4	3
Agricultural	1	-	1	*	1	*
Industrial Arts	*	*	1	*	*	2
No answer	(51)	(8)	(71)	(70)	(31)	(12)
(c) Please give us your best estimate of the proportion of students in your high school graduating class who went on to college.						
More than 3/4	9%	24%	7%	14%	12%	11%
About 1/2 to 3/4	33	31	31	35	38	34
About 1/4 to 1/2	43	34	45	39	36	39
Less than 1/4	15	11	17	13	14	16
No answer	(35)	(6)	(44)	(51)	(15)	(4)
(d) Of your three closest friends in high school, how many went to college?						
None	7%	4%	11%	7%	14%	11%
One	11	9	15	10	17	18
Two	21	16	24	22	24	27
Three	61	70	50	61	46	44
No answer	(89)	(17)	(91)	(112)	(40)	(16)

	University		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
	(2,333)	(578)	(2,740)	(3,014)	(870)	(254)
36. Please estimate the proportion of students in your high school who were Negro.						
75%-100%	8%	10%	18%	17%	10%	14%
50%-74%	2	2	2	3	4	3
25%-49%	6	8	6	7	8	7
10%-24%	10	12	9	8	11	8
5%-9%	11	12	9	9	12	10
Some, but less than 5%	26	35	21	25	26	17
None	37	20	35	31	29	41
No answer	(23)	(9)	(29)	(29)	(14)	(2)
37(a) What was your approximate grade average on report cards in high school?						
A	13%	15%	6%	9%	2%	4%
A-	22	22	14	17	6	11
B+	27	29	25	25	17	16
B	18	17	23	20	23	18
B-	9	9	14	12	16	14
C+	6	6	11	11	18	19
C	3	2	5	5	14	16
C-	1	1	1	1	3	2
D+ or lower	*	-	*	-	1	-
No answer	(12)	(4)	(23)	(24)	(5)	(5)
(b) About where did you stand in your high school graduating class?						
Top quarter	72%	73%	58%	62%	33%	40%
Second quarter	17	16	24	22	26	27
Third quarter	4	5	7	8	18	16
Lowest quarter	1	1	1	1	3	1
Don't know	7	6	9	7	20	17
No answer	(18)	(3)	(24)	(21)	(15)	(3)

APPENDIX C

STATES IN FEDERAL DHEW REGIONS
(FY 1970 and 1971)

STATES IN FEDERAL DHEW REGIONS

(FY 1970)

Region I

- Connecticut
- Maine
- Massachusetts
- New Hampshire
- Rhode Island
- Vermont

Region II

- Delaware
- New Jersey
- New York
- Pennsylvania

Region III

- District of Columbia
- Kentucky
- Maryland
- North Carolina
- Puerto Rico
- Virgin Islands
- Virginia
- West Virginia

Region IV

- Alabama
- Florida
- Georgia
- Mississippi
- South Carolina
- Tennessee

Region V

- Illinois
- Indiana
- Michigan
- Ohio
- Wisconsin

Region VI

- Iowa
- Kansas
- Minnesota
- Missouri
- Nebraska
- North Dakota
- South Dakota

Region VII

- Arkansas
- Louisiana
- New Mexico
- Oklahoma
- Texas

Region VIII

- Colorado
- Idaho
- Montana
- Utah
- Wyoming

Region IX

- Alaska
- American Samoa
- Arizona
- California
- Guam
- Hawaii
- Nevada
- Oregon
- Washington

STATES IN FEDERAL DHEW REGIONS
(FY 1971)

Region I

- Connecticut
- Maine
- Massachusetts
- New Hampshire
- Rhode Island
- Vermont

Region II

- New Jersey
- New York
- Puerto Rico
- Virgin Islands

Region III

- Delaware
- District of Columbia
- Maryland
- Pennsylvania
- Virginia
- West Virginia

Region IV

- Alabama
- Florida
- Georgia
- Kentucky
- Mississippi
- North Carolina
- South Carolina
- Tennessee

Region V

- Illinois
- Indiana
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Ohio
- Wisconsin

Region VI

- Arkansas
- Louisiana
- New Mexico
- Oklahoma
- Texas

Region VII

- Iowa
- Kansas
- Missouri
- Nebraska

Region VIII

- Colorado
- Montana
- North Dakota
- South Dakota
- Utah
- Wyoming

Region IX

- Arizona
- California
- Hawaii
- Nevada
- American Samoa
- Guam

Region X

- Alaska
- Idaho
- Oregon
- Washington

APPENDIX D

SITE VISIT SCHOOLS

SITE VISIT SCHOOLS

Schools	Region (FY 70)	Type	Control
Bacone College	7	Two-Year	Private
Bowdoin College	1	Four-Year	Private
Central Washington State College	9	Four-Year	Public
Chicago State College	5	Four-Year	Public
City University of New York	2	University	Public
Colorado College	8	Four-Year	Private
Community College of Denver	8	Two-Year	Public
Drexel University	2	Four-Year	Private
Earlham College	5	Four-Year	Private
Indiana University at Bloomington	5	University	Public
Lincoln University	6	Four-Year	Public
California State College at Long Beach	9	Four-Year	Public
Miami-Dade Junior College	4	Two-Year	Public
Morgan State College	3	Four-Year	Public
Mount St. Mary College	2	Four-Year	Private
Northeastern State College	7	Four-Year	Public
Reed College	9	Four-Year	Private
Temple University	2	University	Private
Webster College	6	Four-Year	Private
University of Wyoming	8	University	Public

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Council on Education, A Fact Book on Higher Education, third issue, 1970, ACE, Washington, D.C.

2. Astin, A. W., The College Environment, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

3. ________ and Panos, R. J., The Educational and Vocational Development of College Students, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1969.

4. Bayer, A. and Boruch, R., "Black and White Freshmen Entering Four-Year Colleges," Educational Record, Fall 1969, pp. 371-386.

5. Berg, Ivar, Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1970.

6. Bowers, W. J., Student Dishonesty and its Control in College, Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York, 1964.

7. Bowman, J. L., An Analysis of Educational Opportunity Grant Awards (a study conducted on behalf of the U.S. Office of Education by the College Scholarship Service), February 1967.

8. Branson, H. R., "Financing Higher Education for Poor People: Fact and Fiction," College Board Review, Number 77, Fall 1970.

9. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education, McGraw Hill, December 1968.

10. ________, A Chance to Learn: An Action Agenda for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, McGraw-Hill, New Jersey, January 1970.

11. ________, The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges, McGraw-Hill, New Jersey, June 1970.

12. Centra, J. "Black Students at Predominantly White Colleges: A Research Description," Sociology of Education, Summer 1970, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 325-339.

13. Clark, B., "The 'Cooling Out' Function in Higher Education," American Journal of Sociology, 65 (May 1960), 569-76.

14. ________, The Open Door College: A Case Study, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960.

15. ________, Educating the Expert Society, Chandler Publishing Company, California, 1962.

16. Clark, K. B. and Hopkins, J., A Relevant War Against Poverty: A Study of Community Action Programs and Observable Social Change, Harper and Row, New York, 1970.

17. Clurman, Michael, "How Shall We Finance Higher Education?" The Public Interest, Number 19, Spring 1970, pp. 98-110.

18. Coleman, J. C. et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, Washington, D.C., U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

19. College Entrance Examination Board, Financing Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, CEEB, Princeton, New Jersey, 1970.

20. Creager, J.A., Astin, A. W., Boruch, R. F., Bayer, A. E., and Drew, D. E., National Norms for Entering College Freshmen--Fall 1969, American Council on Education, Research Reports, Vol. 4, No. 7, Washington, 1969.

21. Crossland, F. E., Minority Access to College, A Ford Foundation Report, Schocken Books, New York, 1971.

22. Dunham, E. A., Colleges of the Forgotten Americans: A Profile of State Colleges and Regional Universities, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Berkeley, California, 1969.

23. Egerton, J., State Universities and Black Americans: An Inquiry into Desegregation and Equity for Negroes in 100 Public Universities, Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia, 1969.

24. Faltermayer, E. K., "Let's Break the Go-To-College Lockstep," Fortune, November 1970.

25. Feldman, K. A., "Studying the Impacts of Colleges on Students," Sociology of Education, Vol. 42, No. 3, Summer 1969, pp. 207-37.

26. ________ and Newcomb, T., The Impact of College on Students, 2 vols., Jossey-Bass, California, 1969.

27. Fichter, J. H., Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1965.

28. Hanford, G. H. and Nelson, J. E., "Federal Student Loan Plans: The Dangers are Real," College Board Review, Number 75, Spring 1970.

29. Hartnett, R. T., "Differences in Selected Attitudes and College Orientations between Black Students Attending Traditionally Negro and Traditionally White Institutions," Sociology of Education, Fall 1970, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 419-436.

30. Hendrix, O. R., "Student Financial Aids--Address," Congressional Record--Senate, February 3, 1970, S 1097-8.

31. Hyman, H. H., Wright, C. R., and Hopkins, T. K., Applications of Methods of Evaluation: Four Studies of the Encampment for Citizenship, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1962.

32. ________ and Wright, C. R., "Evaluating Social Action Programs," in Lazarsfeld, P. F. et al., The Uses of Sociology, Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1967.

33. Jaffe, A., Adams, W., and Meyers, S. G., Negro Higher Education in the 1960's, Praeger, New York, 1968.

34. ________ and Adams, W., American Higher Education in Transition, Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York, 1969.

35. Jencks, C. and Riesman, D., The Academic Revolution, Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York, 1968.

36. Kerr, Clark, et al., "Financing Higher Education: The Policy Dilemmas" (a symposium), The Public Interest, Number 11, Spring 1968.

37. Kitano, H. and Miller, D., An Assessment of Educational Opportunity Programs in California Higher Education, Scientific Analysis Corporation, California, 1970.

38. Louis, K. S. and Metzger, L., Measuring the Goals of Action Programs: A Case Study of a New Technique, Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York, 1971.

39. McClellan, Frank M., "A Black Student Looks at the Present System of Financial Aid," College Board Review, Number 77, Fall 1970.

40. McGrath, Earl, The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition, Columbia University, Teachers College, 1965.

41. Merton, R. K., "The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action," American Sociological Review, Vol. I, No. 6, December 1936, pp. 894-904.

42. Moynihan, Daniel P., Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding: Community Action in the War on Poverty, The Free Press, New York, 1969.

43. Nash, G. and Nixon, J., Response to Challenge: The New York City Urban Corps, Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York, 1967.

44. ________, "The History and Growth of Student Financial Aid," National Association of College Admissions Counselors Journal, Vol. 13, No. 3, November 1968.

45. ________, The Emergence and Crystallization of a Bureaucratic Function: Student Financial Aid Administration, Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1969.

46. ________, "The Current Status of Financial Aid Administration," National Association of College Admissions Counselors Journal, Vol. 13, No. 2 (1969).

47. National Center for Educational Statistics, Opening Fall Enrollment, 1966, U.S. Office of Education.

48. ________, Opening Fall Enrollment, 1969, U.S. Office of Education.

49. ________, Education Directory 1969-70, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1970.

50. 90th Congress, 2nd Session, House of Representatives, Report No. 1919.

51. Notification to Members of Congress, EOG Report No. 1-69.

52. Notification to Members of Congress, EOG Report No. 1-70.

53. Resnik, S. and Kaplan, B., "Report Card on Open Admissions: Remedial Work Recommended," The New York Times Magazine, May 9, 1971.

54. Rivlin, A., et al., Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education: A Report to the President, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1969.

55. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. III, No. 16 (April 21, 1969).

56. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. V, No. 7 (November 9, 1970).

57. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. V, No. 20 (February 2, 1971).

58. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. V, No. 21 (March 1, 1971).

59. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. V, No. 25 (March 29, 1971).

60. U.S. Bureau of the Census, City and County Data Book, 1962 (A Statistical Abstract Supplement). U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1962.

61. Vincent, Clark E., "Socio-Economic Status and Familial Variables in Mail Questionnaire Responses," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 69, 1964.

62. Weiss, C. H., "Ethical and Political Issues in Social Research," The Social Welfare Forum, National Conference of Social Welfare, Ohio, 1970.

63. Willingham, W. W., Free-Access Higher Education, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1970.

64. ________, "Free Access Colleges: Where They Are and Whom They Serve," College Board Review, No. 76, Summer 1970, pp. 6-14.

65. Wisdom, P. and Shaw, K., "Black Challenge to Higher Education," Educational Record, Fall, 1969.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM

Supported by
United States Office of Education

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
605 West 115 Street
New York, N.Y. 10025

Budget Bureau No. 51-S70002
Approval Expires 7-30-70

The information requested in this questionnaire is regarded as confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only. It will **not** be released in any way that will allow it to be identified with your institution.

This questionnaire is divided into two parts. The first part, which should take no more than 15 minutes for you to fill out, deals with the procedures, policies, and problems of the EOG Program as it operates at your institution. Part II requests various statistics on admissions, enrollment, and financial aid.

Feel free to add comments or explanations at any point. **If you have difficulty providing exact information, your best estimate will still be very helpful.**

PART I. THE EOG PROGRAM: PROCEDURES, POLICIES, AND PROBLEMS

A. Administration of the EOG Program

1-6/

1. In which academic year did the EOG Program start at your school?

7/
1 ☐ 1966-67
2 ☐ 1967-68
3 ☐ 1968-69
4 ☐ 1969-70

2. How important was each of the following individuals in the decision to participate in the EOG Program?

Please check one box on each line		*Very important* (1)	*Somewhat important* (2)	*Not at all important* (3)
a. Financial aid officer	8/	☐	☐	☐
b. President of the institution	9/	☐	☐	☐
c. Trustees	10/	☐	☐	☐
d. Admissions officer	11/	☐	☐	☐
e. Faculty	12/	☐	☐	☐

3. Did you have enough EOG money for 1969-70 to give initial year grants to every student who qualified under the grant determination formula (as defined in EOG Administrative Memoranda, Nos. 4/69 and 1/70)?

a. 13/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

b. **IF NO**: In determining which of the financially eligible students should be awarded an initial year EOG, did you give preference to:

Please answer for each characteristic		*Yes* (1)	*No* (2)
1. Students already enrolled in the institution	14/	☐	☐
2. Entering freshmen	15/	☐	☐
3. Students with better academic performance	16/	☐	☐
4. Students of most extreme financial need	17/	☐	☐
5. Students of minority group background	18/	☐	☐
6. Those who don't qualify for other forms of financial aid	19/	☐	☐
7. In-state or local residents	20/	☐	☐
8. Other *(Please specify)* ____________	21/	☐	☐

4. Of full-time students who have exceptional financial need, which types are generally **not** awarded EOGs?

Check as many as apply

22/ ☐ First term students
23/ ☐ Transfer students
24/ ☐ Married students
25/ ☐ Students whose grades are poor, even though not failing

26/ ☐ Evening students (full-time)
Other types *(Please specify)*
27/ ☐ ____________________
28/ ☐ ____________________

5. a. Does the financial aid office have established practices regarding the **packaging** of financial aid for an EOG recipient? (that is, the proportion of a student's aid coming from EOG as compared with a loan, work-study, or other grant)

29/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

b. In general, is each EOG recipient at your institution required to:

Take out a loan	30/	1 ☐ Yes	2 ☐ No
Work at a term-job	31/	1 ☐ Yes	2 ☐ No

c. Do you lighten the term-job requirements for EOG students, as compared with other students who receive financial aid?

32/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

6. Please indicate the extent to which **each** of the following aspects of the EOG Program is a problem at your institution:

Please check one box on each line		*Major problem* (1)	*Minor problem* (2)	*No problem* (3)
a. Finding students who are eligible for EOGs according to the grant determination formula (as defined in EOG Administrative Memoranda, Nos. 4/69 and 1/70)	33/	☐	☐	☐
b. Estimating the amount of **initial** year funds that will be needed each year	34/	☐	☐	☐
c. Estimating the amount of **renewal** year funds that will be needed each year.	35/	☐	☐	☐
d. Keeping informed about changes in the program (e.g. changes in grant determination formulas, in matching fund sources, etc.)	36/	☐	☐	☐
e. Keeping all of the information on each student which EOG forms require	37/	☐	☐	☐
f. Gathering race and ethnic data required of institutions participating in Federal student aid programs.	38/	☐	☐	☐
g. Timing on notification by USOE of availability of funds	39/	☐	☐	☐
h. Other *(Please specify)* __________ ____________________	40/	☐	☐	☐

7. a. Was the **total** EOG allocation to your institution this year adequate for your needs, inadequate, or more than adequate?

41/ 1 ☐ Adequate 2 ☐ Inadequate 3 ☐ More than adequate

b. If your school had the same total amount of EOG funds, and there were no Federal restrictions in determining the size of an individual grant, would you prefer to:

Please check only one

42/ 1 ☐ Allocate smaller amounts to more students
2 ☐ Allocate larger amounts to fewer students
3 ☐ Allocate according to the present formula

8. In actual practice, how often do you find that you limit the size of individual EOG awards in order to stretch the allocation over a larger number of students?

43/ 1 ☐ Often 2 ☐ Occasionally 3 ☐ Never

9. If you are to have sufficient time to determine the number and size of EOG awards for a given year, what is the latest month that USOE should notify you about the size of your allocation?

______________ 44-45/
Month

10. How often do you speak in person or on the telephone to each of the following about matters relating to the EOG Program?

Please answer for each item		*Several times a month or more* (1)	*Several times a year* (2)	*Almost never* (3)
a. The U.S. Office of Education in Washington:				
(1) EOG Branch	46/	☐	☐	☐
(2) Division of Student Financial Aid, Office of Director	47/	☐	☐	☐
b. The regional office of DHEW/OE	48/	☐	☐	☐
c. Aid administrators at other institutions	49/	☐	☐	☐
d. Other administrators at your institution	50/	☐	☐	☐

B. Recruitment Activities

11. Does your institution utilize any of the following means for recruiting **disadvantaged** students (i.e. students of exceptional financial and educational deprivation)?

Please answer for each item		*Regularly* (1)	*Occasionally* (2)	*Not at all* (3)
a. Making conditional grant commitments to 10th or 11th grade students from poor families	51/	☐	☐	☐
b. Regular contact with high school principals and counselors in poor-area schools	52/	☐	☐	☐
c. Participation in programs like Upward Bound and Educational Talent Search	53/	☐	☐	☐
d. Contact with community agencies, church groups, etc.	54/	☐	☐	☐
e. Contact with Urban League, NAACP, other ethnic organizations (Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, etc.)	55/	☐	☐	☐
f. Coordination of recruitment activities with other colleges in the city or state	56/	☐	☐	☐
g. Lowering or waiving admissions criteria	57/	☐	☐	☐
h. Setting aside institutional funds for financial assistance exclusively for disadvantaged students	58/	☐	☐	☐
i. Other *(Please specify)* ______________	59/	☐	☐	☐

12. a. Does your institution have a **special program** to recruit disadvantaged students?

60/ 1 ☐ Yes *(Please answer 12b, c, and d)* 2 ☐ No *(Please skip to 12e)*

If you have a special program:

b. Please give us the name and office or title of the person in charge of this program:

Name: ______________________________ 61/

Office or title: ______________________________ 62/

c. Is directing this program the sole or primary responsibility of the person named above?

63/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

d. Are EOG funds used to provide financial aid to students recruited under this program?

64/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If you have no special program:

e. Have you ever had such a program?

65/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

13. Many institutions, for various reasons, do not attempt to recruit specifically disadvantaged students. If this is so for your institution, please check here:

66/ 1 ☐

14. Which, if any, of the following factors either limit or prevent your institution from recruiting disadvantaged students?

Please check as many as apply

67/ ☐ a. No need for recruitment; we have sufficient applicants who fall into the "disadvantaged" category
68/ ☐ b. Inadequate funds for recruitment activities
69/ ☐ c. Inadequate funds for financial aid to such students
70/ ☐ d. Inadequate funds for supportive services which such students, once enrolled, might need
71/ ☐ e. The curriculum at this institution is too rigorous for such students
72/ ☐ f. The religious or social climate would make it difficult for such students to adjust
73/ ☐ g. We're unprepared to handle the kinds of problems that other schools have encountered when they admitted such students
74/ ☐ h. We'd like to recruit such students but are concerned about alumni, community, parent, faculty, or student reaction
75/ ☐ i. Other *(Please specify)* ______________________________

1-6/

15. a. What is your best estimate of the proportion of **all** full-time undergraduate students for whom the regular admissions criteria are modified?

Approximate per cent: __________%
7-8/

b. For about what proportion of **EOG recipients** would you say regular admissions criteria are modified?

Approximate per cent: __________%
9-10/

C. Supportive Programs

16. a. Are the following services available at your institution for students who are having difficulty with academic work?

Please check for each item which is available

11/ ☐ (1) Remedial courses in math, English, reading, etc.
12/ ☐ (2) Special tutoring
13/ ☐ (3) Extra counseling or guidance
14/ ☐ (4) Other *(Please specify)* ______________________________

b. **Please check here if no services are available and skip to Question 19.**

15/ ☐

17. a. If any undergraduate's academic work falls below accepted limits, is he required to attend remedial, counseling, or tutorial programs?

16/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

b. Are any entering freshmen required to attend such programs on the basis of their records at the time of admission?

17/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

18. a. What is your best estimate of the proportion of **all** full-time undergraduate students who have used remedial or tutorial services while enrolled at your institution?

Approximate per cent: __________%
18-19/

b. About what proportion of **current EOG recipients** would you estimate have received such services while enrolled at your institution?

Approximate per cent: __________%
20-21/

19. Are students who are having difficulty with academic work encouraged to take fewer credits than the usual full-time load?

22/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

20. a. Are **students** ever employed as tutors for other students who require special academic work?

23/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

b. **IF YES:** Have college Work-Study funds been used for this purpose?

24/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

21. If, at the end of a semester, an EOG student is doing failing work, is the financial aid office notified?

25/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

D. Assessment of the EOG Program at Your Institution

It is very difficult to estimate the impact of a program like EOG, which is only one of several Federal programs to help students who have difficulty paying for college. We would like your opinion, however, about the impact of the EOG Program at your institution.

22. First, would you say that in general, the EOG Program at your institution has been successful in its stated purpose, that is, "to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need . . . . ?"

26/ 1 ☐ Definitely yes 3 ☐ Probably no
2 ☐ Probably yes 4 ☐ Definitely no

23. a. Have you had any increase in enrollment of Negro or other minority-group students at your institution since 1966?

27/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

b. **IF YES:** Would you say that this increase has been:

Check one

28/ 1 ☐ Largely due to the availability of EOG funds
2 ☐ Partly due to EOG, partly other factors
3 ☐ Mostly due to other factors

c. Has your institution been under pressure from the community to admit minority-group students?

29/ 1 ☐ A great deal of pressure 2 ☐ Some pressure 3 ☐ No pressure

361

24. Which of the following statements describe effects which EOG has had at your institution?

Please answer for each item			Yes (1)	No (2)
a.	EOG has enabled us to award grants or scholarships for the first time.	30/	☐	☐
b.	EOG has enabled us to distribute financial aid to more students than formerly.	31/	☐	☐
c.	EOG has enabled us to award more to each student receiving financial aid than formerly.	32/	☐	☐
d.	EOG has fostered unrealistic expectations among students and their families about the amount of financial aid available.	33/	☐	☐
e.	EOG has made us more willing to take a chance on "high-risk" students.	34/	☐	☐
f.	EOG has probably made students less willing to take loans and/or work at term-jobs to finance their education.	35/	☐	☐
g.	EOG has brought a new type of student (from a low-income home) to the institution.	36/	☐	☐
h.	The availability of EOG funds has made it more difficult to raise scholarship money from private sources.	37/	☐	☐
i.	EOG has served as an impetus for initiating or increasing recruitment efforts among minority-groups.	38/	☐	☐
j.	Aside from serving as an additional source of funds for financial aid, EOG has had little impact at our institution.	39/	☐	☐
k.	Other *(Please specify)* ______________________	40/	☐	☐

25. a. Does your institution have any plans to withdraw from the EOG Program in the next few years?

41/
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ Possibly
3 ☐ No **(IF NO: Please skip to 25c)**

b. **IF YES OR POSSIBLY**: Can you explain below why your institution is planning to withdraw from the EOG Program?

____

____

42-43/

c. Do you plan to expand, reduce or maintain the EOG Program at its current level during the next few years?

44/
1 ☐ Expand the program
2 ☐ Reduce the program
3 ☐ Maintain the program at its current level

Part II. INSTITUTIONAL DATA

A. **Financial Aid Data**

This section, in which we are requesting various financial aid statistics, can be filled out by you or someone else in your office who has access to general financial records and EOG records.

26. Costs of attendance:

What are the **annual** charges for a full-time undergraduate student at your institution for:

a. Tuition and fees for in-state or local residents: : $__________ 45-48/

b. Tuition and fees for out-of-state, or out-of-district, residents: *(Only enter a figure here if a and b are different)* $__________ 49-52/

c. Room and board for those living in college facilities on campus: *(Write [0] if there are no college residence facilities on campus)* $__________ 53-56/

27. Approximate per cent of the full-time undergraduate student body receiving any form of financial aid (i.e., grants, scholarships, loans, tuition waivers, etc.):

Approximate per cent:__________% 57-58/

28. Number of students receiving EOG initial and renewal grants for 1969-70:

a. Number receiving EOG initial year grants: __________ *Number* 59-61/

b. Number receiving EOG renewal grants: __________ *Number* 62-65/

29. Number of all students receiving initial and renewal EOGs during 1969-70, who are: *(Enter a zero [0] if none)*

66-68/ __________ a. Negroes
69-71/ __________ b. Spanish-surnamed Americans
72-73/ __________ c. American Indians
74-75/ __________ d. Oriental Americans

79-80/02

1-6/

In questions 30-33, if you are not able to provide exact figures for an item please give us your best estimate of the per cent for that item.

30. Number of all students **currently** receiving EOGs (initial and renewal) who:

		Number	**or**	*Approximate per cent*
a.	Are male	________	7-8/	________ %
b.	Are married	________	9-10/	________ %
c.	Live on campus	________	11-12/	________ %
d.	Were in the top quartile (high) of their high school graduating class	________	13-14/	________ %
e.	Were in the 2nd quartile of their high school graduating class	________	15-16/	________ %
f.	Were in the bottom half (low) of their high school graduating class	________	17-18/	________ %

31. Number of all **1968-69** EOG recipients: 19-22/ ____________ *Number*

32. Number of all 1968-69 EOG recipients who:

		Number	**or**	*Approximate per cent*
a.	Reenrolled for 1969-70	________	23-24/	________ %
b.	Graduated	________	25-26/	________ %
c.	Transferred to another institution	________	27-28/	________ %
d.	Dropped out	________	29-30/	________ %

33. **Approximate per cent of all 1968-69 freshmen EOG recipients** who reenrolled for 1969-70:

Approximate per cent: ____________% 31-32/

364

B. Enrollment and Admissions Data

Not all schools have the facilities or personnel to keep detailed records on their student body. However, we should appreciate as much of the following information as can be supplied, either by you or anyone else who is familiar with enrollment and admissions statistics.

33-37/

38-42/

34. Please give us the full-time undergraduate enrollment figures for 1969-70 for **each** of the following: *(Enter a zero [0] if none)*

43-46/ __________ a. Negroes
47-50/ __________ b. Spanish-surnamed Americans
51-53/ __________ c. American Indians
54-56/ __________ d. Oriental Americans

35. For this question it is very possible that you do not have exact data to provide the percentages we are requesting. If you are not able to give us the exact information, please give us your best estimate for each item and indicate that the percentage is an estimate by checking the adjoining box. **Rather than leave any items blank, please try to give us an approximate percentage in each case.**

					Please check here if per cent is an estimate
a.	Per cent of those who applied for admission as freshmen for 1969-70 who were accepted:	57-58/	______%	59/	☐
b.	Per cent of last year's freshmen who reenrolled for 1969-70:	60-61/	______%	62/	☐
c.	Per cent of all full-time undergraduates who:				
	(1) Are male	63-64/	______%	65/	☐
	(2) Are married	66-67/	______%	68/	☐
	(3) Live on campus	69-70/	______%	71/	☐
	(4) Were in the top quartile of their high school graduating class	72-73/	______%	74/	☐

C. **Your Position**

36. Please indicate your official title (e.g., Provost, Assistant Director of Financial Aid, etc.):

If more than one, please give the title which involves you in the EOG Program.

Title: ______________________________ 75/

37. a. Are you the EOG Designee for your institution?

76/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

IF NO:

b. Do you work directly under the official EOG Designee?

77/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

c. What is the EOG Designee's title? ______________________________ 78/

38. Name of School: ______________________________

79-80/03

Please feel free to use the inside cover of this questionnaire to make any further comments about the operation of the EOG Program at your institution, successes or satisfactions, problems or dissatisfactions you have with the program, clarification of any of your responses, etc.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

FIRST CLASS
Permit No. 55988
New York, N.Y.

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
No Postage Stamp Necessary if Mailed in the United States

Postage will be Paid by:

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
605 West 115th Street
New York, N.Y. 10025

367

Attention: NSF

Staple or tape here

STUDENT DATA FORM

Name of student: ____________________

Permanent address of student: ____________________

____

1-6/

7-8/

Year:

9/ 1 ☐ Freshman 4 ☐ Senior
2 ☐ Sophomore 5 ☐ Other
3 ☐ Junior

Transfer student:

10/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

Is student classified as:

11/ 1 ☐ Resident student (on campus)
2 ☐ Non-resident student

FOR NON-FRESHMEN: Present quartile placement in college:

12/ 1 ☐ Top quarter 3 ☐ 3rd quarter
2 ☐ 2nd quarter 4 ☐ Bottom quarter

Present G.P.A. in college: __________
13-15/

FOR ALL STUDENTS: Is student's EOG for 1969-70:

16/ 1 ☐ An initial grant
2 ☐ A 1st year renewal grant
3 ☐ A 2nd year renewal grant
4 ☐ A 3rd year renewal grant
5 ☐ More than one of the above (initial and renewal grant in same academic year)

Please check **each** of the following supportive or special services which student is receiving or has received.

62/ ☐ Courses in remedial English, math, reading, etc.
63/ ☐ Special tutoring
64/ ☐ Extra counseling or guidance
65/ ☐ Reduced program (fewer courses)

Race or ethnic group: (Include white students in "Other")

66/ 1 ☐ American Indian
2 ☐ American Negro
3 ☐ Oriental American
4 ☐ Spanish-surnamed American
5 ☐ Other

Sex:

67/ 1 ☐ Male 2 ☐ Female

____
(Name of person completing form)

____
(Title or office)

____
(Name of school)

79-80/04

OE Form 1208-3

Budget Bureau No. 51–S 70004
Approval Expires 7-30-70

Please check **each** of the following sources from which student is receiving financial assistance for 1969-70:

	Yes (1)	*No* (2)	
17/	☐	☐	College Work-Study Program
18/	☐	☐	Other student employment
19/	☐	☐	Guaranteed Loan
20/	☐	☐	Other loan
21/	☐	☐	Tuition waiver
22/	☐	☐	State scholarship
23/	☐	☐	Athletic scholarship
24/	☐	☐	Other scholarship
25/	☐	☐	Veterans' Benefits
26/	☐	☐	Disability Benefits
27/	☐	☐	Social Security Survivors' Benefits
28/	☐	☐	Other __________ *(Please specify)*

Amount of student's EOG, 1969-70: $__________ 29-31/

Gross family income of student: $ __________ 32-36/

Number of dependents in student's family: __________ 37/

Is student classified as:

38/ 1 ☐ Independent
2 ☐ Parent-supported

High school program of student:

39/ 1 ☐ College preparatory (academic)
2 ☐ Non-college preparatory

High school rank:

__________ out of class of __________
(rank) 40-43/ *(number in class)* 44-47/

Quartile placement in high school:

48/ 1 ☐ Top quarter
2 ☐ 2nd quarter
3 ☐ 3rd quarter
4 ☐ Bottom quarter

If student took any of the following national examinations, please fill in the appropriate scores:

__________ SAT Verbal 49-51/
__________ ACT Composite 55-56/
__________ SAT Math 52-54/
__________ NMSQ Selection Score 57-59/

Was student admitted:

60/ 1 ☐ Under regular admissions policy
2 ☐ Under special provisions

Was student considered a "high risk" student at the time of admission?

61/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM

Supported by
United States Office of Education

Columbia University
Bureau of Applied Social Research
605 West 115th Street
New York, New York 10025

Budget Bureau No. 51-S 70003
Approval Expires 7/30/70

Dear Student:

This questionnaire is part of a study sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education to provide information about students who have been awarded Educational Opportunity Grants to help finance their college studies. Your school has indicated that you are one of a number of students who have been awarded this type of grant. We are asking you, therefore, to complete this questionnaire which focuses on the various ways in which you meet your college expenses, the problems you may encounter in financing your education, your attitudes about college, your career plans, etc.

We recognize that not everyone will be able to give an exact answer to every question asked, but we should appreciate your giving the answer you believe to be most nearly correct for each question. Please feel free to add your comments or explanations at any point. You may be sure that the information you supply in this questionnaire will be confidential and used only for statistical purposes; your name will not be associated with any answers you give. The questionnaire should take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

As a result of the information received from these questionnaires, the U.S. Office of Education will be better able to continue its work in helping students finance their college education. It is very important, therefore, that you complete this questionnaire as quickly as possible and mail it back to our office. We will pay the postage.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Nathalie Friedman

Nathalie Friedman
Project Director
Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University

P.S. Please return this questionnaire by February 28, 1970.

OE FORM 1208–2

1. a. Please write in the name of your college or university.

____

(Name of college or university)

1-6/

____

(Division or branch, if any)

7-8/

____

(State)

b. What is your present class in college?

9/
1 ☐ Freshman
2 ☐ Sophomore
3 ☐ Junior
4 ☐ Senior
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* ________________

c. For how many years have you been taking courses in any college, either as a full-time or part-time student? *(Please check the appropriate answer)*

This year is my:

10/ ☐1st ☐2nd ☐3rd ☐4th ☐5th ☐6th ☐7th or more

d. Is the number of credits you are taking this semester considered a full-time program or less? *(Please check the appropriate category)*

11/
1 ☐ Full-time
2 ☐ About ¾ time
3 ☐ About ½ time
4 ☐ Less than ½ time

2. a. About how many miles from your permanent home is the college you are attending?

__________ Approximate number of miles
12-14/

b. Are you living in your permanent home while you attend college?

15/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

IF NO:

c. Where are you living this term while attending college?

16/
1 ☐ Dormitory or residence hall
2 ☐ Fraternity or sorority house
3 ☐ Relatives' home
4 ☐ Co-op housing
5 ☐ Off-campus home or apartment under college control
6 ☐ Off-campus home or apartment not under college control
7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* ________________________

3. **We would like to know two things:**

a. When did you first decide you would go **to college**? *(Please check in column [a])*

b. When did you first decide you would go to the **college you are now attending**? *(Please check in column [b])*

	(a) *to college* 17/	(b) *to this college* 18/
I always just assumed I would go	1 ☐	1 ☐
Before high school	2 ☐	2 ☐
During 10th or 11th grade	3 ☐	3 ☐
During my senior year in high school	4 ☐	4 ☐
After graduating from high school	5 ☐	5 ☐

4. a. Please tell us how important **each** of the following persons or groups was in your decision to attend **this** college. Were they very important, somewhat important, or not at all important?

Please check one box on each line		*Very important* (1)	*Somewhat important* (2)	*Not at all important* (3)
(1) Your parents	19/	☐	☐	☐
(2) If married: your husband or wife	20/	☐	☐	☐
(3) A high school teacher or guidance counselor	21/	☐	☐	☐
(4) High school friends	22/	☐	☐	☐
(5) A representative from the college	23/	☐	☐	☐
(6) Graduates or students from the college whom you or your parents knew	24/	☐	☐	☐
(7) People you worked with on a job	25/	☐	☐	☐
(8) Some community group, agency, or program (e.g. Upward Bound, Educational Talent Search, etc.)	26/	☐	☐	☐
(9) Other person or group *(Please specify)* ______________________	27/	☐	☐	☐

b. Now, please go back and **double-check** [√√] for the one person or group you feel was most important in your decision to attend this college.

28/

373

c. There are many **factors** which help a person decide to go to one college or another. We would like to know how important **each** of the following was in your decision to attend **this** college:

Please check one box on each line		*A major reason for my decision* (1)	*A minor reason for my decision* (2)	*Unrelated to my decision* (3)
(1) The opportunity to live at home	29/	☐	☐	☐
(2) The opportunity to live away from home	30/	☐	☐	☐
(3) The opportunity to be with students like yourself	31/	☐	☐	☐
(4) The low cost of the college	32/	☐	☐	☐
(5) The availability of financial aid	33/	☐	☐	☐
(6) The academic program	34/	☐	☐	☐
(7) The religious program or atmosphere	35/	☐	☐	☐
(8) The athletic program	36/	☐	☐	☐
(9) Some other factor *(Please specify)*	37/	☐	☐	☐

d. Now, please go back and **double-check** [√√] for the one factor above which was **most** important in your decision to attend this college.

38/

5. At the time that you applied to the college you are presently attending, had you applied to any other college?

39/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

IF YES: Were you accepted by another college?

40/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

6. Please indicate how much of your college and living expenses this year is being financed through **each** of the following sources: *(For each item, please indicate whether it pays a great deal, some, or none of your college expenses this year.)*

	Please check one box on each line		*Pays a great deal of my expenses* (1)	*Pays some of my expenses* (2)	*Pays none of my expenses* (3)
a.	Support from parents	41/	☐	☐	☐
b.	Support from spouse	42/	☐	☐	☐
c.	A state scholarship	43/	☐	☐	☐
d.	An Educational Opportunity Grant	44/	☐	☐	☐
e.	An athletic scholarship	45/	☐	☐	☐
f.	A scholarship or tuition waiver from the college	46/	☐	☐	☐
g.	Other scholarship	47/	☐	☐	☐
h.	College Work-Study (Federal)	48/	☐	☐	☐
i.	Institutional student employment	49/	☐	☐	☐
j.	A National Defense Student Loan	50/	☐	☐	☐
k.	A Guaranteed Loan	51/	☐	☐	☐
l.	Other loan	52/	☐	☐	☐
m.	Social Security Survivors' Benefits	53/	☐	☐	☐
n.	Veterans' Benefits (G.I. Bill)	54/	☐	☐	☐
o.	Other sources: *(Please specify)*				
	____________________	55/	☐	☐	☐
	____________________	56/	☐	☐	☐

7. a. Please estimate the **total** amount of financial aid you are receiving this year **through the college** (that is, through grants, loans, work-study, athletic scholarships, etc.).

Estimated total: $____________
57-60/

b. Can you tell us how much money you are receiving this year from your Educational Opportunity Grant?

Amount of EOG: $____________
61-63/

c. Do you find that the overall amount of financial aid you are receiving this year is sufficient to meet your **basic college expenses** (e.g. tuition, fees, room and board charges, books)?

64/ 1 ☐ Yes *(Please answer d)* 2 ☐ No *(Please skip d and answer e)*

d. **IF YES**: Is it sufficient to meet various other expenses as well (e.g. transportation, laundry, recreation, etc.)?

65/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

e. **IF NO**: How much additional money do you estimate you will need to meet basic expenses?

$ ____________
66-68/

8. a. In what month were you notified about the amount and kind of financial aid you would be receiving this year?

Month: ________________
69-70/

b. Would you have preferred to have been notified sooner?

71/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

9. It's hard to say, but which of the following statements **best** describes what you probably would have done if you had not received financial aid from this college?

Please check only one box

72/
1 ☐ I would somehow have managed to attend this college as a full-time student anyway.
2 ☐ I would have managed to attend this college, but probably as a part-time student.
3 ☐ I would have attended a different college, either full-time or part-time.
4 ☐ I would probably not have been able to go to college.

10. Will you need some kind of financial aid next year in order to continue your education?

73/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

11. Many people are not aware that financial aid is available for students who otherwise would have difficulty paying for college.

a. When did you first find out that you might be eligible for financial aid?

Please check only one box

74/
1 ☐ Before my senior year in high school
2 ☐ During my senior year in high school
3 ☐ After I finished high school, but before I started college
4 ☐ After I was in college

79-80/05

1-6/

7-8/

b. How did you happen to find out that you might be eligible for financial aid?

Please do two things:

a. Check **all** the sources through which you heard you might be eligible

b. **Double-check** [√√] the one which most influenced you to **apply** for financial aid

9/ ☐ 1. High school principal, teacher, or guidance person
10/ ☐ 2. High school friends
11/ ☐ 3. Parents or other relatives
12/ ☐ 4. Upward Bound or Educational Talent Search program
13/ ☐ 5. Group in my community which helps students who might have difficulty meeting college expenses
14/ ☐ 6. College catalogue or other college publication
15/ ☐ 7. College officer or representative
16/ ☐ 8. College friends
17/ ☐ 9. Other *(Please specify)* ____________________

Be sure that you have double-checked for the one which most influenced you to apply for financial aid.
18/

12. We are interested in some of your opinions about financial aid and about college. For each pair of statements, therefore, would you tell us which one you agree with more. You may not agree **completely** with either statement, but please check the one which more nearly corresponds to your opinion.

a. *(Choose one)*

19/ 1 ☐ Grants should be awarded to any student who wants to, but cannot afford to go to college.

OR

2 ☐ Grants should be awarded primarily to students **with high academic promise** who could not otherwise afford to go to college.

b. *(Choose one)*

20/ 1 ☐ Working at a job during the school year should be avoided if at all possible.

OR

2 ☐ It's better to work for the money to pay for college than to accept a grant.

c. *(Choose one)*

21/ 1 ☐ Borrowing money to pay for college should only be done as a last resort.

OR

2 ☐ Loans are a good way to finance a college education

d. *(Choose one)*

22/ 1 ☐ Even with a good education I will have a hard time getting the right kind of job.

OR

2 ☐ With a good education I should have little difficulty getting the kind of job I want.

13. a. Would you say that most students at your college come from families with:

23/
1 ☐ About as much money as your family
2 ☐ More money than your family
3 ☐ Less money than your family

b. Compared to most students in this college, would you say your grades are:

24/
1 ☐ Below average
2 ☐ Average
3 ☐ Above average

c. How hard do you work to get good grades at college?

25/
1 ☐ Very hard
2 ☐ Quite hard
3 ☐ Not so hard

14. a. How do you find college work compared to what you had expected?

26/
1 ☐ About as difficult as you had expected
2 ☐ Less difficult than you had expected
3 ☐ More difficult than you had expected

b. How friendly do you find most students here compared to what you had expected?

27/
1 ☐ About as friendly as you had expected
2 ☐ More friendly than you had expected
3 ☐ Less friendly than you had expected

c. In general, how satisfied are you with the college you are presently attending?

28/
1 ☐ Very satisfied
2 ☐ Somewhat satisfied
3 ☐ Somewhat dissatisfied
4 ☐ Very dissatisfied

378

15. a. College students have different ideas about the main purpose of a college education. We would like to know how important **each** of the following purposes is for you.

Please check one box on each line		*Very important* (1)	*Somewhat important* (2)	*Not important* (3)
1) To develop skills and knowledge directly applicable to a career	29/	☐	☐	☐
2) To obtain a broad general education and appreciation of ideas	30/	☐	☐	☐
3) To acquire an understanding and interest in world and community affairs	31/	☐	☐	☐

b. Now, please go back and double-check [√√] the **one** purpose which is **most** important to you.

32/

c. Not only do college students have different ideas about what they want to get out of college, but **colleges** themselves have many different purposes. How important do you think it is for a college to emphasize **each** of the following?

Please check one box on each line		*Very important* (1)	*Somewhat important* (2)	*Not important* (3)
1) To provide good vocational, professional, or technical training so that students can get good jobs and have a decent standard of living	33/	☐	☐	☐
2) To provide a moral atmosphere that is friendly and cooperative where differences among people can be resolved	34/	☐	☐	☐
3) To become noted for its high academic standards and for the research and scholarship of its faculty	35/	☐	☐	☐
4) To encourage the expression of conflicting points of view and to give students and faculty a great deal of freedom in making policy	36/	☐	☐	☐

d. Now, please go back and double-check [√√] the **one** aim you consider **most** important for a college to emphasize.

37/

16. a. While you were in high school, did any representative from the college you're presently attending visit your high school to speak with students?

38/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't know

b. While you were in high school, did you hear about programs like Upward Bound or Educational Talent Search where high school students get special help to prepare them for college?

39/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

c. **IF YES**: Did **you** participate in any program like this?

40/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

17. a. Does the college you are attending offer any of the following opportunities to students who may need special help?

Please check one box on each line		*Yes* (1)	*No* (2)	*Don't Know* (3)
Does the college offer:				
1) Remedial courses in math, English, reading, etc.	41/	☐	☐	☐
2) Special tutoring	42/	☐	☐	☐
3) Extra counseling or guidance	43/	☐	☐	☐
4) Permission to take fewer credits than the usual full-time program	44/	☐	☐	☐

b. Which of the above have **you** used at this college?

Please check the box or boxes

45/ ☐ Remedial courses
46/ ☐ Special tutoring
47/ ☐ Extra counseling
48/ ☐ Fewer credits

380

CAREER PLANS

18. How far do you expect to go in school?

49/ 1 ☐ Some college but no degree
2 ☐ Associate of Arts degree (2 years)
3 ☐ B.A. or B.S. degree
4 ☐ Graduate or Professional degree (e.g. M.A., M.S., M.D., Ph.D.)
5 ☐ Undecided

19. a. When you finish your education, what sort of job or field do you think you will go into? You may not find the exact job listed, but check the **one** that comes closest.

50-51/ 01 ☐ College teaching, scientific research, academic research
02 ☐ Law, medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine
03 ☐ Ministry
04 ☐ Elementary or high school teaching
05 ☐ Social work, library work, guidance, psychology, home economics
06 ☐ Architecture, engineering, chemistry
07 ☐ Nursing, occupational therapy, medical or dental or laboratory technician, etc.
08 ☐ Business, sales, administration, real estate, computer programming, insurance, accounting
09 ☐ Public relations, advertising, journalism, publishing, writing, entertainment, art, music
10 ☐ Secretary, stewardess, office work, modeling
11 ☐ Machinist, construction work, electrician, foreman in mine or factory
12 ☐ Armed forces, policeman, fireman, detective, sheriff
13 ☐ Farming, ranching, lumbering, fishing
14 ☐ Housewife
If you are undecided, please check here 15 ☐

b. Please give your best estimate of the amount of money you expect to **earn** annually about five years after you finish your education:

52/ 1 ☐ Under $5000
2 ☐ $5,000 - $7,499
3 ☐ $7,500 - $9,999
4 ☐ $10,000 - $12,499
5 ☐ $12,500 - $14,999
6 ☐ $15,000 - $19,999
7 ☐ $20,000 or more
8 ☐ I don't expect to work

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

About yourself:

20. Sex: 53/ 1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

21. Race: 54/ 1 ☐ American Indian
2 ☐ Negro (Black, Afro-American, West Indian)
3 ☐ Oriental American
4 ☐ White
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* ____________________

22. Ethnic background:

55/ 1 ☐ Puerto Rican
2 ☐ Mexican-American
3 ☐ Other Spanish-speaking or Latin American background
4 ☐ None of these

23. Age last birthday: 56-57/ ____________ Age

24. Religion (Optional):

58/ 1 ☐ Catholic
2 ☐ Protestant
3 ☐ Jewish
4 ☐ None
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* ____________________

25. Marital status:

59/ 1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married and living with spouse
3 ☐ Separated or divorced
4 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* ____________________

26. Where did you live most of the time while you were growing up?

60/ 1 ☐ On a farm, ranch, or reservation
2 ☐ In a small town
3 ☐ In a moderate size town or city
4 ☐ In a suburb of a large city
5 ☐ In a large city

27. a. Have you ever served on full-time active duty in the armed services?

61/ 1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

b. **IF YES:** For how many years: ________________ 62/

About your family:

Father

28. a. Was your father born in the United States?

63/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

b. **IF NO**: In what country was your father born?

Country: ____________________

64/

29. a. Is your father living?

65/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

b. **IF NO**: How old were you when he died?

Years: ____________

66-67/

Mother

28. c. Was your mother born in the United States?

68/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

d. **IF NO**: In what country was your mother born?

Country: ________________

69/

29. c. Is your mother living?

70/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

d. **IF NO**: How old were you when she died?

Years: ____________

71-72/

30. How far in school did your parents go? (**If you are married**, please also tell us how far in school your husband or wife has gone.)

	73/ *Father*	74/ *Mother*	75/ *Husband or wife*
No schooling, or some grammar school	1 ☐	1 ☐	1 ☐
Completed grammar school (8th grade)	2 ☐	2 ☐	2 ☐
Some high school (9th, 10th, 11th grade)	3 ☐	3 ☐	3 ☐
Completed high school	4 ☐	4 ☐	4 ☐
Some college	5 ☐	5 ☐	5 ☐
Completed college	6 ☐	6 ☐	6 ☐
Graduate or professional school	7 ☐	7 ☐	7 ☐

79-80/06

1-6/

7-8/

31. a. How many **older** brothers and sisters do you have?

(Enter a zero [0] if none) Number: ________
9/

b. If you have any **older** brothers or sisters: Have any of them had a year or more of college?

10/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

c. How many **younger** brothers and sisters do you have?

(Enter a zero [0] if none) Number: ________
11/

d. If you have any **younger** brothers or sisters: Have any of them had a year or more of college?

12/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

The next several questions refer to your family. By family we mean those persons with whom you grew up while you were in high school (e.g., your natural parent[s], step-parent[s], foster parent[s], etc.)

32. a. During the time that you were in high school, who was the head of your family?

13/ 1 ☐ My father or stepfather
2 ☐ My mother or stepmother
3 ☐ A grandparent
4 ☐ A brother or sister
5 ☐ Another relative (aunt, uncle, cousin)
6 ☐ Someone else *(Please specify relationship)*
____

b. What was the major occupation of the head of your family during the time you were in high school? You may not find the exact occupation below, but please check the category which comes closest.

14/ 1 ☐ Professional or semi-professional (doctor, lawyer, teacher, medical technician, minister)
2 ☐ Business owner or manager, farm owner
3 ☐ Salesman or clerical worker
4 ☐ Skilled worker (carpenter, plumber, electrician, tailor, foreman in factory or mine)
5 ☐ Protective or service worker (policeman, fireman, barber)
6 ☐ Semi-skilled worker (bus driver, machine operator)
7 ☐ Workman or laborer (fisherman, farm worker, gas station attendant, longshoreman)
8 ☐ Unemployed
9 ☐ Don't know

c. Has your family ever received welfare payments?

15/ 1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

33. a. About how much would you estimate your family's total income from all sources was last year? *(If married, answer for your parental family anyway.)*

16/ 1 ☐ Under $3,000
2 ☐ $3,000 - $4,449
3 ☐ $4,500 - $5,999
4 ☐ $6,000 - $7,499
5 ☐ $7,500 - $8,999
6 ☐ $9,000 - $10,499
7 ☐ $10,500 - $11,999
8 ☐ $12,000 or more
9 ☐ Don't know

b. Are **you** contributing money to your family?

17/ 1 ☐ Yes, quite a bit
2 ☐ Yes, a little
3 ☐ No

About your high school:

34. a. When did you graduate from high school or receive a high school equivalency diploma?

Month: ____________ 18-19/
Year: ____________ 20-21/

b. About how many students were in your high school graduating class?

Number: ____________ 22-25/

35. a. Was there an academic or college preparatory program in your high school?

26/ 1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

b. Which of the following describes the high school program in which **you** were enrolled?

27/ 1 ☐ General
2 ☐ Academic or college preparatory
3 ☐ Commercial or business
4 ☐ Vocational
5 ☐ Agricultural
6 ☐ Industrial Arts

c. Please give us your best estimate of the proportion of students in your high school graduating class who went on to college.

28/
1 ☐ More than ¾
2 ☐ About ½ to ¾
3 ☐ About ¼ to ½
4 ☐ Less than ¼

d. Of your three closest friends in high school, how many went to college? *(Write zero [0] if none)*

Number: ____________
29/

36. Please estimate the proportion of students in your high school who were Negro.

30/
1 ☐ 75% - 100%
2 ☐ 50% - 74%
3 ☐ 25% - 49%
4 ☐ 10% - 24%
5 ☐ 5% - 9%
6 ☐ Some, but less than 5%
7 ☐ None

37. a. Please check your approximate grade average on report cards in high school.

31/	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+ or lower
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

b. About where did you stand in your high school graduating class?

32/
1 ☐ Top quarter
2 ☐ Second quarter
3 ☐ Third quarter
4 ☐ Lowest quarter
5 ☐ Don't know

79-80/07

Name: ____

Permanent address: ____

____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE STAPLE OR TAPE AND MAIL. WE WILL PAY THE POSTAGE.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

FIRST CLASS
Permit No. 55988
New York, N.Y.

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

No Postage Stamp Necessary if Mailed in the United States

Postage will be Paid by:

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
605 West 115th Street
New York, N.Y. 10025

Attention: NSF

Staple or tape here